THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

One effect of the bitter persecution launched against the Jews by the Axis Governments has been the increasing sympathy felt by Christians for the sufferers. Not unnaturally we are beginning to ask whether a deeper understanding and even a communion in worship are not possible. The question has been raised in a clear form, and an answer has been attempted, by Father Lev Gillet in his recent *Communion in the Messiah*. Father Gillet is an Orthodox Christian, who was for some years on the staff of the Russian Theological Seminary in Paris, and he has made himself an expert in all matters concerning the Jewish faith.

What is it that keeps Jew and Christian apart? The tradition of mutual hostility is many centuries old, but was it ever fully justified? Much has been written in recent years to show how close Jesus was to the Pharisee, and it was from Pharisaism that later Judaism developed. In ethical standards, in the belief that there is but one living and true God, in the conviction of a life after death, Jesus was entirely at one with the great Rabbis and their successors. He attacked them, it is true, but it is worth pointing out that, according to the Gospel record, it was they who rejected Him, not He who broke away from them. St. Paul, though he fought against the imposition of Judaism on Gentile believers, remained a Jew and observed Jewish law himself throughout his active missionary life. Among the bitter Christian antagonists of Judaism in the Early Church were to be found apologists like Justin Martyr, who sought to win the Jew by sympathy, not by denunciation. Judaism has developed, as Christianity has done, during the centuries, but it should be possible to recover this spirit.

How far can there be a *rapprochement* between Jewish and Christian theology? As Father Gillet rightly points out, every allowance must be made for the Jewish stress on tradition, and a valid approach will show how a genuine Christian creed can develop naturally from the thought of the Jewish Fathers. Even a Trinitarian interpretation of the godhead is not impossible along Jewish lines. In the *Memra* and the *Shekinah* we have conceptions which seem to adumbrate the Christian doctrine of the Son, though it is not easy to see how the Incarnation (a doctrine fundamental to true Christian belief) will be made acceptable to the Jewish mind. Christian acceptance of the Holy Spirit is a direct inheritance from Old Testament religion. A belief in an objective Atonement, too, has always been characteristic of Judaism. The conception of a suffering Messiah has often been dimly suggested, though it never took a prominent place in Jewish thought, and is seldom, if ever, intimately related to the Atonement. There is much in Christian theology from which Judaism would necessarily withhold assent, but in the Old Testament and the Fathers there may be found ideas which may serve as a basis on which a genuine Jewish-Christian theology may be built up.

In actual worship there is a much wider area of common ground. The mysticism of the Zohar may well appeal to any Christian, and it is easy to worship in the normal service of the Synagogue; indeed the liturgy of most Churches owes much to the Jewish prayer-book. Conversely it is possible for Jews to share to a large extent in Christian worship, though its central act, the Eucharist, is naturally meaningless to them. But Dr. Levertoff has shown how far it is possible to produce a form of Hebrew Christian worship which has a strong appeal to the devout Jew.[1]

Any form of Christianity which is to prove attractive to the Jew must be strongly Messianic. Father Gillet sees here a real opportunity for closer relations between adherents of the two faiths. It is true that the one is looking for a return of a Christ who has already been manifested in bodily form, while the other looks forward to his first appearance. But still there is the common hope and the common ideal, and the two groups may well labour together for the coming of the Kingdom of God.

Father Gillet has a number of practical suggestions to make, and his intimate knowledge of Judaism gives them authority. Their essential

[1] See *The Wailing Wall*, by Olga Levertoff.

feature lies in the appeal for a recognition of a special Jewish branch of the Christian Church. He has given reasons for thinking this to be both possible and desirable, and he would be the last to insist that details are unalterable. Above all, the Jew must be made to feel that he can become a Christian without abandoning his racial heritage in blood and faith. He can remain a Jew, and can find in Jesus, not one who demands a complete break with his ancestral past, but one who is the true consummation of his spiritual life. For Jesus came, not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it.

Colleagues and pupils of Dr. Wheeler Robinson have 'presented' to him on his seventieth birthday a volume entitled *Studies in History and Religion*. One of the most interesting and valuable of the fourteen essays in the volume is that on 'Formgeschichte and its Limitations,' by Mr. L. H. MARSHALL, Tutor in New Testament Interpretation in Rawdon Baptist College. It deals with a subject which is extremely important both for the understanding of the New Testament and for a belief in its authenticity. And so it concerns both scholar and preacher.

No doubt we must be on our guard against overestimating it. Every new idea or theory is invariably over-valued. We have seen this successively with Darwinism, the Higher Criticism, the 'Koine,' the New Psychology. They have all been proclaimed as the key to truth and it has been inevitably discovered in time that the key does not quite fit. Similarly, *Formgeschichte* has been presented as the key to the problem of Gospel tradition, and very probably it will go through the same process of pruning as all the other theories have done, until the truth in it is discovered and takes its place in the realm of knowledge.

Formgeschichte is concerned with the stage of Oral Tradition in the formation of the Gospels. What were the factors and forces at work shaping and fashioning the Tradition during its oral stage? Probably the first stage in the development of the Oral Tradition is to be found in early Christian worship. This was characterized by great freedom. Anybody could make a contribution, and we may be fairly certain that members of the congregation who had been eye-witnesses of the ministry of Jesus would contribute reminiscences of His words and deeds. Accuracy was ensured by the fact that other eye-witnesses were present who could corroborate or correct these addresses.

Thus it came about that the story of the life and teaching of Jesus was circulated in separate oral units which were to some extent fixed in certain definite literary forms. And *Formgeschichte* is concerned with the nature and origin of the 'forms' in which these units of tradition had become more or less rigidly fixed. What are these forms? Mr. MARSHALL gives us a list of those classified by the critics. The first is the short story which culminated in a memorable word of Jesus. An example is the incident which led up to 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.'

The 'negative' Form-critics hold that the narrative portion of these units is fiction. Only the saying is genuine. But there is no foundation in either fact or experience for such a suggestion. Mr. MARSHALL says that he heard General Booth speak thirty years ago, and still remembers vividly many of the stories he told and the arresting saying which capped them. This is exactly what the Gospels present, and nothing is needed to explain their presence there but the ordinary laws of memory.

Another 'form' is the miracle story which is expansive and rich in detail, and has certain features common to all such stories. It lays emphasis on the desperate state of the patient, gives a precise account of how the cure was effected and lays stress on the completeness of the cure. The negative critics suggested that these stories were modelled freely on the Jewish and Hellenistic miracle-tales which were current at the time. But here again Mr. MARSHALL has a parallel to cite from his own experience. A young surgeon told him the story of one of his own achievements which had exactly the same features as the Gospel stories. And if we believe (as we well may in view of modern therapeutic advances) that such cures were possible, the Gospel narrative does not stand in need of any explanation outside itself.

The other 'forms' are 'stories about Jesus' which the negative critics label 'legends,' traditions of His teaching and the story of the Passion. Now, says Mr. MARSHALL, granted that Jesus lived and laboured, taught and suffered and died on the Cross, it is difficult to see how the story of His life could have been told in any other 'forms.' If you take as a parallel Lord Charnwood's 'Life of Abraham Lincoln' you find the same forms—short anecdotes culminating in some remarkable saying which the world will not soon forget; stories of compassionate deeds; accounts of important events in his life; isolated sayings

whose exact occasion has been forgotten; connected discourses in the form of set speeches; and the final tragedy in the theatre at Washington.

What is of real value in *Formgeschichte*? One contribution it makes of a positive kind is the fact that the Tradition, for the most part, was shaped and fashioned into more or less fixed 'forms' within the Christian community while eye-witnesses of our Lord's ministry were still alive. 'The fixed form (writes E. F. Scott) would serve a double purpose. On the one hand it made the facts easy to remember. . . . On the other hand the fixed form would act as a safeguard. It might almost be claimed that the teachers who put the record into form were the earliest critics of the Gospel history. In their own fashion they had examined the material and placed the stamp of their approval on that which they found trustworthy.'

Another claim of *Formgeschichte* is to some extent valid. It supplies a sound critical method for distinguishing between primary and secondary traditions in the Gospels. Any method which enables us to prune the text of later traditions and to get nearer to the original is obviously to be welcomed as a powerful aid in New Testament interpretation.

The obvious, and often blatant, defect of *Formgeschichte* is its arbitrariness and subjectivity. Critics like Dibelius and Bultmann often simply rule out the historicity of narratives on their 'say so.' Sometimes one critic explains a narrative away in one fashion while another totally rejects the first one's ideas and explains it away in a totally different fashion. Part of a story may be accepted as true and another part regarded as an invention. Sometimes two narratives which have no apparent connexion are regarded as variants on the ground that they have a similar 'form.' The centurion's servant and the Syro-Phœnician woman are so treated.

Instances of this arbitrariness could be multiplied indefinitely. Occasionally it is quite gross. Bultmann starts by accepting Wrede's assumption that the disciples had no belief in the Messiahship while Christ was alive; their belief was born of their faith in the Resurrection. And, *therefore*, Peter's confession of Christ at Cæsarea Philippi is dismissed as a 'legend.' In point of fact the extravagances of *Formgeschichte* all arise from the false view (their crowning subjectivity) that the Gospel record consists largely of material manufactured by the Church to explain and justify her faith. But when it is suggested that it was early Christian faith that created, *i.e.* invented, the record, we are bound to ask what was it, then, that gave birth to early Christian faith? We shall, in the end, extract its real contribution from this new method of criticism. But it is already obvious how much of it will have to be discarded.

The Rev. W. E. Sangster, Minister of the Central Hall, Westminster, has published a thesis which has been approved for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London. It is an examination and restatement of John Wesley's doctrine of Christian Perfection. It is entitled *The Path to Perfection*.[1]

It is a careful and competent piece of work, well worthy of the imprimatur of the University of London. Though composed for doctoral honours, it does not contain much technical theology or psychology; and indeed the nature of the subject does not necessitate that. Accordingly, it makes easy and straightforward reading.

The author reminds us that the doctrine of Christian Perfection was a chief preoccupation of Wesley's mind from 1725 till he died in 1791, and that it involved him in more controversy and odium than anything else he taught. He was of opinion that salvation is in two stages. First comes justification and practical sanctification; then comes entire sanctification, in which the heart is wholly cleansed from sin. But he never claimed this latter experience for himself.

After examining the Biblical, theological, and psychological foundations of the doctrine of Christian Perfection, the author proceeds to a restatement of it, such as will remove the inconsistencies in Wesley's exposition. He begins by saying that the fundamental questions are, 'Can we be free from sin, can we know it, and should we say so?' and that 'Perfect Love' rather than 'Christian Perfection' is the state of soul contemplated by Wesley.

Normally, the early Methodists enjoying a high experience of salvation talked not of being cleansed from all sin but of being 'filled with love,' which is certainly a less dangerous way of putting it. The one clear, unequivocal witness of the phrase, 'I am free from sin,' is the saintly John William Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley; and it is credibly reported that when Voltaire was challenged to point to a character as perfect as that of Christ he at once mentioned Fletcher of Madeley; also

[1] Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net.

that Wesley, preaching Fletcher's funeral sermon, took as his text: 'Mark, the perfect man.'

But it is gravely dangerous to say, 'I am freed from sin.' It may argue insensitivity of conscience. In any case no man knows what is in him. It should therefore be stressed that the early Methodists spoke of the love from on high that filled their hearts rather than of their freedom from all sin. Something, they felt, had been given to them that was not of this earth, and it burned within them seeking for itself positive and active expression. 'The stress belongs to supernatural love, not eradicated sin.' 'Wesley's spiritual instinct, and that of the mass of his people, was sounder than Wesley's logic.'

Says the author again: 'There is but one way for earnest and adoring souls to witness to the mighty love which God gives to those who ask Him. They must so live that other people will be forced to find the explanation of their lovely lives in Christ. When the inevitable questions arise, they can attempt to whisper the open if unspeakable secret of it, and say that this is God's free gift of supernatural love through faith in Christ. They will be careful to speak seven words about Him for every single word about themselves.'

In developing further his restatement of the doctrine under review the author contends that the quest of perfection is not misconceived, that holiness is not a mirage, that the raptured souls who think to have received of God the gift of supernatural love are not of necessity mistaken. We must not set any limit to what God can do with a soul in this mortal life. On the other hand, it should be said again that no man can have so intimate a knowledge of himself as justly to claim to have reached perfection's height.

The author is well aware that his plea for the substance of Wesley's doctrine is ruled out in advance by those who adhere to the teaching of the Westminster Divines. He quotes indeed from the Larger Catechism: 'No man is able, either of himself, or by any grace received in this life, perfectly to keep the commandments of God, but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed.' Nor can he but allow that the religious conscience of our time is chiefly on the side of the Westminster Divines.

The Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

By the Reverend C. S. Petrie, B.A., B.D., Stawell, Victoria, Australia.

In the first article of the Series, 'After Fifty Years,' in the Fiftieth Volume of The Expository Times (p. 8), Dr Vincent Taylor justly complained that opponents of the Proto-Luke hypothesis had in the main contented themselves 'with vague expressions of dissent.' With no less truth he might have added that the hypothesis is often accepted with equal facility. This short article is not an attempt to cover every last detail for or against the hypothesis, which would require a volume at least as long as Dr Taylor's own. Nor is it an attempt to proffer some new or alternative theory, for this is not necessarily involved in any examination of the hypothesis. It is simply an attempt to present briefly some of the difficulties in the way of assenting to 'Proto-Luke,' particularly in the Galilean section of the Gospel.

The Sources Mark and Q.

It is, of course, commonly agreed that, in addition to that which is peculiar to itself, the Third Gospel is compiled of material derived from two main sources, viz. Mark's Gospel, and the source referred to as 'Q.' In regard to these, any attempt to classify the contents of the Gospel must bear in mind two factors, and, though each is a truism, they must be emphasized because they are not always remembered in the exposition of the Proto-Luke hypothesis.

First, the fact that we have Mark for actual comparison provides an objective test which must constantly be applied to any theory about the use or disuse of Mark. The tangibility of Mark alone among Luke's sources may perhaps make it difficult to avoid undue prejudice in favour of Mark; yet, unless and until better substantiated proof is forthcoming, we rightly incline to such real support as Mark's presence affords. This means, too, that if and when traces of Mark's influence seem to show themselves, they must be explained, and not simply explained away.

Secondly, 'Q,' except in the broadest terms, at present is not, and cannot be, satisfactorily delineated. Not even its unity can be taken for

granted. About 'Q,' certain probabilities, but not more than probabilities, can be affirmed. This widely used and much abused symbol should be reserved to denote the non-Marcan material common to Matthew and Luke, and should include only that material which has close verbal similarity in the two. For unless some such objective delimitation is imposed, worthless subjective reconstructions are inevitable. The lists compiled by Dr James Moffatt [1] furnish evidence of what untempered speculation may offer: these variously include in Q upwards of 600 verses (over 50 per cent) of Luke, with the ascription to Q by one theorist or another of the whole of Lk 9^{57}–18^{15}. Since comparisons of Luke even with the demonstrable Mark are by no means always satisfying, 'the Elusive Q' certainly calls for cautious treatment.

Proto-Luke and Q.

This leads to Dr Taylor's attitude to Q. 'It is important,' he says, 'to insist that the Proto-Luke Theory is not really dependent upon any views we form of Q or other early documents such as M and L. There is an advantage in assuming, as a basis of inquiry, orthodox views concerning Mark and Q.' [2] Now this may be convenient, but it is not satisfactory, particularly when, later on, it is insisted that 'the discussion of St. Luke's use of Q is indispensable, as preliminary to the consideration of any 'special source' embedded in the Third Gospel,' [3] and accordingly a chapter is devoted to such discussion. Either Q matters, or it does not. If it matters, and if the Proto-Luke Theory is not independent of Q, then Q should not have been thus early discounted, nor should reference have been made to the 'orthodox view' (whatever that may be) without some attempt to define the elastic Q. If it does not matter, then the discussion is irrelevant, and Q may simply be absorbed in the rest of the non-Marcan material. Is it significant of a careless regard for Q that Streeter's reconstruction of Q does not precede but follows his elaboration of Proto-Luke?

'Non-Marcan' Material.

From this arises a further consideration. Both Streeter [4] and Dr. Taylor [5] make use of the alternation of Marcan and non-Marcan sections in Luke. But, unless the Marcan elements were so interwoven as to be indistinguishable, Luke could be subdivided under almost any theory into successive occurrences of Marcan and non-Marcan material. If we were quite sure of Q or of the specifically Lukan material (which will be referred to as L) we could in like fashion speak of Q and non-Q, or of L and non-L. As it actually happens however, these 'blocks' or 'stripes' are of such diverse size and distribution that they can be considered only in wide terms and lend no support to the Proto-Luke hypothesis. It should also be observed that, until their real unity has first been shown, the preponderance of Q and L against Mark means nothing, for not one of three, Mark, Q, or L, is greater than the other two combined. In any case, too much is made of the Marcan and non-Marcan 'blocks.' Seeing that Mark is the only source available from which a true check may be made, we are entitled at most to say no more than this, and then only in regard to the Marcan passages, that when Luke is using Mark, apparently he prefers to follow one source only for the time. The appearance of Marcan blocks would support this, but there is no other legitimate deduction, except, perhaps, the inference that Luke attributed a certain importance to Mark in these passages since he does not interpolate. The mere alternation of Marcan and non-Marcan material (with or without any consideration of Q) in itself allows of no deduction as to the unity or otherwise of what is non-Marcan. But the constant reiteration of the term 'non-Marcan' might easily tend to an unconscious assumption of its unity.

In this connexion Streeter seems impressed by the fact 'that both the beginning and the end of the Gospel' (*i.e.* Luke) 'belong, not to the Marcan, but to the non-Marcan strain.' [6] But this fact bears no special weight. That the end should not come from Mark is scarcely surprising, when Mark is incomplete; and, unless Luke had determined, like Mark, to 'plunge at once *in medias res*,' any introductory paragraph would make his beginning 'non-Marcan.'

Method of Treatment.

Again, both Streeter and Dr. Taylor, for reasons of their own, start not at the beginning but at the end of Luke's Gospel. They first discuss the Passion Narrative, and, after their own treatment of what is the most difficult section of the Gospel in its relation to Mark, work to the passages that present less difficulty. While, of course, they must be allowed freedom in presenting their theory, it is more usual, and here surely it would have been more profitable, to proceed from the known to the unknown, from the passages where the source is clear and well-established to those where there is less certainty. The attractive

[1] *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3, 197–202.
[2] *Behind the Third Gospel*, Introduction, vi.
[3] *Ib.*, 144.
[4] *The Four Gospels*, 207–8.
[5] *Behind the Third Gospel*, 184.
[6] *The Four Gospels*, 208.

arrangement and presentation of their materials may, without deliberate intention, win support for the case at the expense of some of the facts. The several sections of Luke, and not any artificial groupings of them, must be kept in their proper and known sequence within the whole.

The Galilean Ministry.

Leaving aside the distinctive Infancy Narrative (which is not touched by the hypothesis), the Third Gospel may be divided into three main well-defined sections :

(1) 3^{1}–9^{50}, the Galilean Period, in which Mark appears as a source ;
(2) 9^{51}–18^{14}, the Central Section, from which Mark disappears ;
(3) 18^{15}–24^{53}, the Judean Period, in which Mark reappears.

It is proposed to deal chiefly, and in some detail, with the first of these sections.

Taken over the whole Gospel there is, as we have seen, a preponderance of ' non-Marcan ' material. There are, however, other important aspects besides this general quantitative superiority. The Galilean Period extends to 9^{50}, when not only does a new section begin but Mark obviously drops out. Yet, in this first section, there is a nice balance between what is from Mark and what is not. Out of 326 verses, 156 (=47.9 per cent) are admittedly Marcan ; Dr. Taylor does not concede to Mark the passage $6^{12\text{-}19}$ (see below), with which the balance would just swing in Mark's favour. In respect of quantity, at any rate, Mark is not here overruled.

Of importance also is the adherence by Luke to the order which Mark observes. Even if, as the Proto-Luke hypothesis requires, the passage 3^{1}–4^{30} is denied in substance to Mark, Mark's order persists, and for the whole section 3^{1}–9^{50}, the order, with few exceptions, agrees with Mark. Moreover, the exceptions do not indicate serious disagreement with Mark.

The Dating and the Genealogy.

Before considering these exceptions, a word must be said about Luke's Dating ($3^{1\text{-}2a}$) and the Genealogy ($3^{23\text{-}38}$). These do not affect the hypothesis either way, and, although it makes the claim, the hypothesis does not serve specially to explain them. Be the document what it may, the date is no more than a prefix to that document, and Proto-Luke has no lien on its significance. The Genealogy, on any showing, is an awkward insertion, and Proto-Luke offers nothing new in explanation or in smoothness. The indication that it follows the first reference to Jesus in the main narrative of this third chapter is not excluded when Proto-Luke is rejected. The contents remain and mean the same.

Difference in Order.

Turning now to the divergence from the Marcan order, the first of these, $3^{19\text{-}20}$ (John's Imprisonment), by completing here John's part in the story, is an improvement, replacing or summarizing Mk $6^{17\text{-}18}$.

The Rejection at Nazareth ($4^{16\text{-}30}$) is an amplification or a replacement of Mk $6^{1\text{-}6}$, and is set earlier in the narrative. Whatever the reason for this, signs of rearrangement are not wanting, for not only does the reference to Capernaum in *v.*^{23} now anticipate *v.*^{31}, but *v.*^{23}, scarcely expected after *vv.*$^{14\text{-}15}$, does not well accord with *vv.*$^{32.\ 36}$.

The mention of Nazareth calls for comment on the method whereby all connexion with Mark is removed even in the verses prior to this passage. Streeter remarks, and Dr. Taylor apparently accepts his remark, ' that, whereas Mk 1^{14} says that Jesus after the Temptation went into *Galilee* Matthew and Luke agree in mentioning that He went first of all to *Nazareth* (Mt 4^{13}, Lk 4^{16}).' [1] Both the wording and the implication of this remark appear to be in error. For both Matthew and Luke, with Mark, begin this section by first saying that Jesus went ' into Galilee.' Matthew, following Mark, links this with John's arrest, to which Luke has already referred (3^{20}). Matthew then (4^{13}) speaks of Jesus, not going to, but ' leaving Nazareth,' whereas Luke says that He ' came to Nazareth ' (4^{16}). Apart from this precarious ' agreement ' against Mark, Streeter is hardly justified in attributing rather usefully to Q a reference to Nazareth, when the coming into Nazareth appears to be part of the Lukan incident which it is supposed to explain. Ubiquity is not a postulate of Q.

The next passage is the Draft of Fishes ($5^{1\text{-}11}$), which replaces Mk $1^{16\text{-}20}$. This incident at the Lake comes unexpectedly between ' preaching in the synagogues ' and an 'event ' in one of the cities ' ; James and John are brought in abruptly ; there is a similarity in *v.*^{11} to Mk 1^{18}, especially in the plural response to Jesus' call, which in Luke is addressed only to Peter. These points must not be unduly pressed, but they do agree with the general impression that the Marcan order, even when it was altered, was at least known and supplies the main setting.

The next disturbance of Mark's order occurs in $6^{12\text{-}19}$. Two short sections, $6^{12\text{-}16}$, the Choice of the Twelve, and $6^{17\text{-}19}$, Healings of the Multitude, are transposed. Dr. Taylor does not allow these two sections to Mark, and this issue must also be

[1] *The Four Gospels*, 206 ; *Behind the Third Gospel*, 76, n. 2.

faced. Professor Creed has occasion to complain that 'Dr. Taylor's numerical method of dealing with the words peculiar to each evangelist is not satisfactory without reference to the actual similarities and dissimilarities in each case'; [1] and the discussion justifies the complaint. For, with regard to *vv.*17-19, the Marcan parallels are first dismissed: 'only 21 of St. Luke's 62 words occur in Mk 3$^{7-12}$. Not one of them is important and several of them are place-names.' [2] And then, a few lines later a precarious argument from silence is used by Dr. Taylor in what may well be, and probably is, a brief condensation by Luke. Now, there are 25, not 21, words common to the two narratives (=40.3 per cent, not 33.9 per cent). The 'several' place-names are four, grouped in two similar pairs by both Mark and Luke; whereas one pair does not occur in Matthew; these are not unimportant. In the other section, *vv.*12-16, again, the lightly dismissed parallels are the significant part of the passage, and Luke's record that Jesus went out 'to pray' is not so material, because Luke makes a similar addition to the Marcan Transfiguration story. The Choice of the Twelve, which in Mark, and also in Matthew, is consequent on the needs of the increasing multitudes who follow Jesus, now is without explanation. Luke's transposition allows the preaching which follows to be linked with the healings in *vv.*17-19. Furthermore, the parallel passage, Mk 3$^{7-12}$, in itself describes a typical scene and is quite unobtrusive. But it is remarkable that in both Matthew and Luke the Sermon is given immediately following their use of this same Marcan passage, in which each has much less in common with the other than with Mark. (Matthew, who retains a connexion with the crowds, has the Call of the Twelve later.) Dr. Taylor's preference for a 'non-Markan document' as the source of Lk 6$^{12-19}$ ignores both this and the 'coincidence' that the independent Proto-Luke should have alighted on the same striking sequence. There is no adequate reason why these verses should not augment the Marcan total given earlier.

The section 6^{20}–8^{3} is a non-Marcan passage, in which often only an arbitrary decision can pretend to distinguish sources. The passage has been so edited as to present a general sequence, but there is nothing to indicate at what stage of compilation that general sequence was established. The inner connexions are loose and sometimes missing. In the Sermon (6$^{20-49}$) the resemblances to Matthew suggest a common source, although there are significant variations, and there seems to have been some editorial adjustment by both Matthew and Luke. The Centurion's Servant (7$^{1-10}$) follows in Luke immediately on the Sermon, whereas in Matthew the parallel to Mk 1$^{40-45}$ intervenes, and the narrative background at the beginning of each varies considerably. Next is the Widow's Son at Nain (7$^{11-17}$), an incident peculiar to Luke, perhaps suggested by the preceding narrative, and preparing the way for the Baptist's Question (7$^{18-23}$) and Jesus' Testimony to John (7$^{24-35}$), which are parallel to Mt 11$^{2-19}$. In illustration probably of the previous verses, there is given the story of the Woman who was a Sinner (7$^{36-50}$), a Lukan passage remotely suggesting Mk 14$^{3-9}$, which is omitted. Then comes a reference to the Ministering Women (8$^{1-3}$), found only in Luke.

At 8^{4}, Luke admittedly returns to Mark, and from here to 9^{50}, not only does Luke use Marcan material, but again he follows, with one exception, the Marcan order of what he uses. The exception relates to Mk 3$^{31-35}$, Christ's Real Brethren. Instead of taking up Mark exactly where he left off, Luke omits Mk 3$^{20-30}$. Thus deprived of its Marcan connexion, the other passage (Mk 3$^{31-35}$= Lk 8$^{19-21}$) is introduced a little later, where its purpose may be to emphasize Lk 8^{15}.

The Use of Mark.

It should be apparent from the foregoing outline, not, of course, that Mark was Luke's primary source throughout his Gospel, but that, in the first main section of Jesus' Ministry, 3^{1}–9^{50}, there is at least as much of Marcan as 'non-Marcan' material, and that, whatever the sources, the sequence is so close to Mark as to suggest some superior recognition. Dr. Taylor claims that his hypothesis accounts for the fidelity to Mark's order 'by the view that what the Evangelist sought from Mark in the process of expanding Proto-Luke were "extracts" homogeneous in character and subject-matter.' [3] It is a noteworthy feature, surely, that, in this section, these 'extracts' succeeded in just doubling the quantity of material, and that, expanded or unexpanded, the narrative shows right through a remarkable coincidence in order with the document from which the 'extracts' were made. The Proto-Luke theory hurries a little too rapidly over the deficiencies of its 'non-Marcan source' in the Galilean Period. [4]

The Lukan Sermon apparently depends for the point of its introduction upon something which links it with Mk 3$^{7-12}$. Apart from this initial link, the remaining sections down to Lk 8^{3} have no closer relation to each other than that provided by straightforward editing. The three distinctively Lukan passages are all concerned with

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 86 n.
[2] *Behind the Third Gospel*, 82.
[3] *Behind the Third Gospel*, 195, cf. p. 131.
[4] *Ib.*, 185–6.

women; they may well have originated from one common source, to be included here in the general narrative. The more reasonable conclusion, especially when a definite point for its introduction is traceable, must be that the combined passages 6^{30}–8^{3}, edited so as to give a sense of continuity, are an insertion into the Marcan background. The denial of Lk 6^{12-19} to the Marcan source, so as to make the introductory section one with the Sermon, demands too much.

Luke 3^{1}–4^{30} *and Mark.*

A demand not dissimilar is made when the initial section 3^{1}–4^{30} is denied completely to Mark. That the section is 'non-Marcan' Streeter considers to be 'a point fundamental to his argument,'[1] and in this contention he has Dr. Taylor's support.[2] But detailed examination[3] makes it plain that, if the ascription of 3^{1-22} and 4^{1-13} to Q is not wholly arbitrary, certainly the complete proscription of Mark from these verses is not warranted. And it must be insisted that the undefined and indefinable Q, even if it were shown to overlap, must here first wait until any claims for Mark are considered, since it has been shown that Mark is at least dominating the order of presentation. The number of verses resembling Mark is certainly few (Lk $3^{2b-4.\ 16.\ 21-22}$, 4^{1-2}), but then the Marcan version itself is here compressed into few verses.

The Value of Mark.

This opening section is at one with the whole account of the Galilean Ministry in this: the order of events, and the backbone of their wording, runs very close to Mark. That Luke in the next section practically deserts Mark does not affect the issue here. That section, it might be said, simply carries to an extreme what happens in this. Mark's narrative was fairly rich in action, but it was not strong in teaching. Both Luke and Matthew have supplemented the narrative with teaching from other sources richer in sayings, but Mark must have had very real value not lightly to be disregarded. One great weakness of the Proto-Luke hypothesis is that it makes so much depend on thrusting Mark into the background, and demonstrates its own material on that assumption; whereas, in this first great section, Lk 3^{1}–9^{50}, even if there only, Mark is in no way a secondary source.

If the foregoing contentions are correct, the Proto-Luke hypothesis fails to make good at the beginning, where it should have started, instead of commencing with the difficult Passion and Resurrection Narratives, where sources are far less clearly defined.

Other Considerations.

But there are other considerations which must be insisted on in less detail. While simplicity is a commendation, the hypothesis seems to over-simplify when it makes the compilation of our Third Gospel no more than the combination of Mark and 'the non-Marcan source.' The resolution of 'Proto-Luke' into 'Q' plus 'L' is only slightly less simple. For it is sheer assumption to assert that either Q or L, or eventually their combination, is a unity. Throughout the whole Gospel, the connexions are often loose and vague, so that the omission of paragraphs could pass unnoticed and the impression of unity remain, if there were no other Gospel by which to check. These connexions frequently would fit more than one context. The omission, say, of 7^{2-35} or of 8^{22-56} (two passages chosen literally at random) would not seriously disturb the apparent continuity of the remaining narratives. This argument from the 'continuity' of the 'non-Marcan source' is regarded with greater impressiveness than it deserves, and the 'unity' is more apparent than real.

Streeter observes one strong objection to the acceptance of the non-Marcan document as Luke's principal source, viz. 'that, while we can observe all cases where Luke has preferred his other source to Mark, we do not know, since Luke's other source or sources are lost, that he may not as often have discarded their version in favour of Mark's.'[4] Streeter concedes the possibility of Marcan superiority 'in some cases,' but he surely begs the question when he goes on to speak of the 'frequency' of Luke's preference of the non-Marcan version, for there is no standard by which it may be judged whether this preference was less or more frequent than the other, and also when he adds 'the verifiable reason that Luke derives about twice as much from Proto-Luke as he does from Mark,'[5] for this bulk unity is the point at issue.

The Lukan Preface.

This over-simplified unity also makes at once too little and too much of the Preface to Luke's Gospel. In order to escape the literal implication of acquaintance with the rhetorical 'many' previous narrators, Luke is reduced by the hypothesis to dependence on at most three, 'Q,' 'L,' and Mark. Did he not more probably know, and use, as he suggests, the knowledge and work of others? But, whatever his sources of information, the plain, natural meaning of the Preface

[1] *The Four Gospels*, 205.
[2] *Behind the Third Gospel*, 76.
[3] Mr. Petrie has added the details, but these have had to be omitted for lack of space.—EDITOR.
[4] *The Four Gospels*, 212.
[5] *Ib.*, 212.

surely is that now, for the first time, he is bringing them together in writing for the 'most excellent Theophilus.'

Dr. Taylor invokes the Preface against his critics in a most striking paragraph: 'If Proto-Luke was never published, Luke was under no obligation to mention it; and if, on the other hand, it was a first draft of the Gospel, he could, with added justice, claim to have "traced the course of all things accurately from the first."'[1] Unless the force of this declaration is somewhere beneath the surface, it is hard to regard it seriously. Are we being told that the Preface contains some hitherto unrecognized record of the publication of Proto-Luke? Rather does it seem, on any serious view of the Preface, that the first proposition of Dr. Taylor's paragraph is entirely irrelevant, except to make the second proposition sound impressive. And, as for the second, any remote hint of a 'first draft' must be read into, and not out of, Luke's words. Nor is any 'added justice' needed for Luke's claim by offering a hypothetical 'first draft.'

[1] *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 200.

Literature.

DEAN INGE IN DISGUISE.

Talks in a Free Country, by Dr. William Ralph Inge, formerly Dean of St. Paul's (Putnam; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Inge has put his new volume of essays in dramatic form by using the device of a symposium. The first talk is at the house of a certain Lord Winterbourne and the *dramatis personæ* are the noble lord, a retired Calcutta merchant, a Hindu and a bishop. The subject is 'Escape' (O that I had wings like a dove). The second subject, 'Miracle, Myth and Mystery,' is discussed at the rooms of a Fellow of St. Thomas's College, Oxford, and 'those present' were a journalist, a former Dean of St. Thomas's, a senior scholar and the Fellow. Other stimulating talks are on The Dismal Science, John, Jonathan and Fritz, and Cradles and Coffins. I need not say that the book is everywhere interesting. We read anything the Dean writes with pleasure because it is sometimes challenging, frequently provocative and always well-informed, and the most provocative things are so epigrammatically said that you enjoy them even when you don't agree. What could be better than this, for example: 'A man who has found his work, and who is happily married, has squared his accounts with life.' Or the pungency of this: 'Churches after all are secular institutions, in which the half-educated cater for the half-converted.' Or this: 'If women are ever sufficiently educated to be emancipated from each other, they will agree that pearls and diamonds are worth only a few shillings, since sham ones look just as well.' That kind of thing is scattered over the book in profusion, and leads you to annoy some one who is in the room with you, absorbed in another book, when you blurt out: 'I say, listen to this.'

Most of the characters in these charades are thin disguises of the Dean himself, and they discuss the kind of themes that have appeared in previous essays. We have the same old criticism of the belief in 'automatic progress.' I have never been able to understand Dr. Inge's repudiation of this belief. It seems to me an entirely Christian one, if you substitute 'inevitable' for 'automatic.' If God is in evolution I cannot imagine any other result than a quite assured progress from good to better. And I think that history is a very good confirmation of this.

One of the most interesting talks is on the Future Life, and Dr. Inge gives some support to what seems to be the conclusion to which many Christian thinkers are coming, the theory of conditional immortality. Eugenics, of course, figures largely in this book. But, whatever the subject may be, and Dr. Inge is strictly contemporaneous in his interests, we are always entertained and frequently instructed. By the way, one of the characters (I hope not a disguise) is allowed to make a bad misquotation of Scripture (pp. 35–36).

F. J. Rae.

In the Drew Lectureship in Biography Bishop Francis John McConnell chose for his subject 'Six English Contributors to American Thought and Action.' These lectures are now published under the title of *Evangelicals, Revolutionists and Idealists* (Abingdon-Cokesbury; $1.50). The six short biographies which make up the book are of Governor Oglethorpe, Wesley, Whitefield, Tom Paine, Berkeley, and Wilberforce. It may seem at first sight not easy to discern any large measure of unity in this group, but the lecturer has skilfully woven them together and shown a real connexion between them. The lectures are much more than miniature biographies; they are marked by keen discernment and sound criticism with an intelligent awareness of historic movements and a fine sensitiveness to human issues. There is not a dull page in the book.

The Faith of a Jewish Woman (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net) is from the pen of Miss Lily H. Montagu, a well-known social worker. She founded the Jewish Religious Union for the advancement of Liberal Judaism, and in this little book she records the story of her spiritual pilgrimage from the Jewish Orthodoxy in which she was reared

(she was a daughter of the first Lord Swaythling) to the Liberalism in which her faith now rests. Throughout her simple and graphic story there is paid grateful homage to the influence of the late Professor Claude G. Montefiore, to whom the volume is inscribed. In a final chapter she seeks to explain further the conception and scope of the Liberal Jewish faith.

The Lord's Supper, by the Rev. W. G. Ovens, M.A., LL.B. (Church Association ; paper 2s. net, cloth 3s. net), is written from the evangelical standpoint and is directed against the abuse and over-emphasis of the Sacrament by the High Church party in the Church of England. The writer is well versed in Scripture and brings convincing proof of the simplicity of Apostolic practice. He argues strongly for the supremacy of the Word over the Sacrament, for the Sacrament is made intelligible by the Word and without the enlightening Word its celebration becomes but a mechanical and superstitious ritual.

Meditations on the Parables, by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc. (James Clarke ; 2s. 6d. net), is intended as 'sermon suggestions for busy clergy.' Besides the usual parables a number of parabolic sayings are treated, such as the savourless salt, the fowls and the lilies, the old and new wine-skins. The meditations are brief and make pleasant reading, but they do not go very deep and they almost completely lack illustrations which are, above all else, the goodly pearls which 'busy clergy' seek after.

Dr. Robert H. Thouless's new book, *Straight Thinking in War Time* (English Universities Press ; 7s. 6d. net), is a characteristic product of his eminently cautious mind. He suggests, in an epilogue, that perhaps a better title would have been 'An attempt to straighten some of the crookedness in war-time thinking.' We can imagine that he enjoyed writing this book, for in previous volumes he provoked less scrupulous readers by his hesitation to commit himself to clear-cut conclusions. It will not be hard to guess what the topics in this book are, atrocity stories, racial theories, war guilt, the causes of war, propaganda. And in regard to all these he classifies crooked thinking under such names as incantation, inconsequent argument, wishful thinking, selected instances and so on. The book has a wide range, embracing philosophy, history, psychology, and ethics. Perhaps it would be unfair to say that the reader will be left with the uneasy feeling that he cannot come to any conclusion about anything. But certainly his blood will be cooled by the successive waves of cold water thrown upon him. Sometimes one is inclined to protest that Dr. Thouless confuses straight thinking with calm thinking, for, even under the influence of passion, the thinking may be straight enough, as in the demand for justice on the Nazi murderers. And sometimes what Dr. Thouless calls crooked thinking is simply lying. But on the whole the warnings given here are both necessary and sound, and this book will have a healthy influence on those of us who are apt to rush at conclusions and let our prejudices ride us. There is an interesting chapter on Hitler as a paranoiac in which for once Dr. Thouless lets himself go—a little.

God Wills It, compiled by the Rev. A. T. Houghton, M.A. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship ; 4d.), is fitly described in the sub-title as 'The Bible Background of Missions Overseas.' It is little more than a catena of Scripture passages bearing on the evangelization of the world. They are here put together in an orderly way and arranged under a number of appropriate headings. It is sometimes forgotten that the Bible is a missionary book throughout, but no one can read these pages without getting a deeper impression of the fact and of its implications.

The Rev. Canon Spencer Leeson, Headmaster of Winchester College, has issued a devotional study of *The Holy Communion* (Longmans ; 2s. 6d. net). It is the Bishop of London's Lent Book, and the Bishop himself commends it in a Preface, in which he expresses the hope that the book may help some to see more clearly as true and relevant the aspects of reality embodied in the Sacrament and so to follow through, with the author, to 'the simplicity of worship which transcends analysis.' The study is based upon Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer. It expressly seeks to avoid technicalities and rigid definitions, undue preoccupation with rites and ceremonies, and foggy pietism. This it succeeds in doing, and also in making use of theology and history in order to assist devotion. While the study is primarily intended for members of the Church of England, it will be found helpful beyond that communion.

Studies in History and Religion : Presented to Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., on his seventieth birthday ; edited by the Rev. Ernest A. Payne, B.A., B.D., B.Litt., Senior Tutor in Regent's Park College, Oxford (Lutterworth Press ; 21s. net), is a tribute to a distinguished teacher by his pupils and colleagues. The subjects chosen by these fourteen writers illustrate the diversity of Dr. Wheeler Robinson's scholarship and interests. This is emphasized by the appendix which contains, in four large pages, a list of Dr. Wheeler Robinson's writings. The contributors are not so well known as their teacher, but their essays are not only varied but marked by sound scholarship and in some cases originality. The essays deal with topics from the Old and New Testaments and also from 'doctrine.' The only thing lacking which would have enhanced this admirable volume is an account of Dr. Wheeler Robinson's career.

The Religious Education Press has issued an extremely useful book for Youth Leaders. It is entitled *Talking Things Over* and is edited by Mr. R. G. Martin, M.A. (3s. 6d. net). It contains notes for discussion on thirty-six live topics. First there is a section dealing with questions of General Conduct such as, Can you be a Christian

in business ? What's the harm in a little flutter ? etc. Then follow sections dealing with questions on World Issues, on Belief, on Jesus. The treatment is always sane and practical, and the suggestions given should be of great value to leaders of Youth Centres, Clubs, and Brotherhoods. We can warmly commend the book to all such, as well as to readers interested in religious and moral problems.

Stories Jesus Heard, edited by Miss Bertha C. Krall (Religious Education Press ; 3s. net), contains about a score of the best Old Testament stories told for children. 'The stories are by a number of different writers, all experts in the field of Christian education for the child, and in the art of story-telling.' By this means a certain variety of presentation and freshness of treatment is secured which makes the book very suitable for reading to young children.

Judaism, like Christianity, has undergone a long development since the close of the Biblical period, and if others wish to understand the Jew, it is necessary to take into account many facts in history and in thought. Not the least important of these is the mysticism which has been present in Jewish thought from Roman imperial days, and has, from time to time, given rise to movements which have permanently affected the Jewish outlook and character. Unfortunately, but little is known of these movements by the world in general, and we must, therefore, give a warm welcome to Professor Gershom G. Scholem's *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Schocken Publishing House, Jerusalem). Originally a series of lectures delivered before the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, this book traces the history of the various mystical movements in the Kabbalah from the 'Throne-mysticism' of the Mishnah age (to some extent affected by the influences which gave rise to Christian Gnosticism) through the mediæval German mystics, Abulafia, the Zohar, Isaac Luria, and Sabbatai Zevi, to Baal Shem, and the comparatively modern Hasidim. It is impossible here to give a detailed account of this very important work ; suffice it to say that it is marked by deep and sympathetic insight, sane and balanced judgment, and profound scholarship. Its preparation has involved an immense amount of research, since by far the greater part of the material exists only in MSS which have not been published. It is difficult to overestimate our debt to Dr. Scholem, whose book should be studied by every one who wishes to understand the spiritual history of Judaism and the influences which have gone to make the Jew what he is to-day.

The Epistle to Diognetus (S.P.C.K. ; 6s. net) has been published by Mr. E. H. Blakeney, M.A. It consists of the original Greek text, with Introductory Notes and a Commentary, of the second-century letter of that name. This letter depends on a single MS. of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, which once was the property of Reuchlin, and which was lost when the Strassburg Library (to which it had found its way) was burned down during the Franco-German war of 1870. Our knowledge of the original now depends upon certain transcripts. Mr. Blakeney, who furnishes an adequate Introduction and a very useful and scholarly body of Annotations, refers his readers to the English Versions by Lightfoot, Kirsopp Lake, and others ; but he passes over a little book, which might well be used along with his own by a beginner in Patristic Greek. For it contains, besides the Greek text, an Introduction, Notes, and—it is for this we name it—a Translation ; the editor and translator is W. S. Walford.

The Rev. G. C. Richards, D.D., Canon of Durham Cathedral, has written a little book on *Baptism and Confirmation* (S.P.C.K. ; 2s. 6d. net). It appears to have been prompted by a recorded saying of Westcott's, 'If Confirmation had always been properly understood, many of the controversies about Baptism would never have arisen.' And it is an attempt to unfold the teaching of the prayer in 'Sursum Corda' : 'That it may please Thee to draw to the waters of regeneration those who as yet are unbaptized, and to perfect in all hearts the work of Thy baptismal grace by the unction and seal of Thy Holy Spirit.' There is high doctrine involved here, and it is expounded learnedly—and reasonably—by the author of this volume, who has collected the principal data of the subject from the Christian writings of the first four centuries. Those centuries, as he says, are 'the traditional foundation of any Anglican building.' As for the meaning of Confirmation, it is not, says our author, the confirmation by the candidate of the baptismal vow made for him in infancy, it is being confirmed or strengthened. The candidate must no doubt confirm the aforesaid baptismal vow, but the essential object of the rite is that he should be the recipient of a gift. Confirmation is 'the sacrament of gift.' At the same time it is 'the sacrament of universal priesthood,' by virtue of which the whole ordained body corporately offers the Eucharist along with the celebrating priest, and completes the offering by communicating. Dr. Richards thinks it vital to the very existence of the Church of England in the twentieth century that it should proclaim this 'ordination of the laity.'

Citizenship and Civil Obedience.

Romans xiii.

By the Reverend W. J. Grant, M.A., Watford.

In the thirteenth chapter of Romans, Paul deals with the very pertinent issues of Citizenship and Civil Obedience. These have provided problems in the higher circles of life. Since the fall of the Roman Empire at the beginning of the fifth century there have been such problems as the Divine Right of Kings, and the conflict between Church and State as to which is supreme.

This article seeks to deal with the relevance of the chapter for the ordinary Christian citizen. How pertinent it is will become evident if we take Moffatt's translation and read but these two sentences: 'Every subject must obey the government-authorities,' and 'the magistrate is God's servant for your benefit.' When he wrote to Timothy, Paul counselled that 'supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgiving are to be offered for all men—for kings and all in authority.' Here he advocates obedience, and that for the following reasons:

(*a*) In their function they are deterrents to evil-doing. 'Magistrates are no terror to an honest man, though they are to a bad man . . . a magistrate does not wield the power of the sword for nothing, he is God's servant for the infliction of divine vengeance upon evil-doers.'

The positive aspect of the function of the government-authority is to serve men. 'The magistrate is God's servant for your benefit . . . since magistrates are God's officers, bent upon the maintenance of order and authority.'

(*b*) Their office was a commission from God. 'The existing authorities have been constituted by God.'

Now that is an imposing array of claims for any state and its order of government. Paul made the claim for the Roman Empire—for Rome in the earlier phases of its greatness, before any inherent weakness had become evident. It was the Empire of which Paul was proud to claim his citizenship: Rome which undoubtedly was a great institution. Morris in *A History of Political Ideas* writes: 'Thus Roman organization brought nearly all that man could desire,' and again, 'the success of that empire had been so evident that the peoples who had lived securely under its shadow only looked back with regret and gratitude to the comfort and prosperity they had enjoyed.'

So much for the Roman Empire! But what of the big modern states? Would Paul have given the same instruction to Pastor Niemöller in Germany under Nazi rulership, for example? That raises the question of citizenship and civil obedience in the modern states in general, and in totalitarian states in particular. Are we bound to carry out the letter of the law contained in such a chapter in the circumstances in which we are placed to-day?

In *Church, Community and State*, J. H. Oldham defines the totalitarian state as 'a state which lays claim to man in the totality of his being; which declares its own authority to be the source of all authority; which refuses to recognize the independence in their own sphere of religion, culture, education and the family; which seeks to impose on all its citizens a particular philosophy of life; and which sets out to create by means of all the agencies of public information and education a particular type of man in accordance with its own understanding of the meaning and end of man's existence.' This is in flat contradiction to Paul's idea of the State. He conceived that the authority of the State is God-given. The government-authority and the magistrate are executors and administrators of the law of God by the authority of God. Of the modern state 'which declares its own authority to be the source of all authority' we can only conceive that Paul would say that it is a perversion with no legitimate claim to our obedience.

This seems to be emphasized by Paul's introduction of the concept of conscience. He is true to the New Testament emphasis that the value of virtue is not in the act but in the motive which prompts it. Hence we find him writing in the chapter that 'you must be obedient, therefore, not only to avoid the divine vengeance, but as a matter of conscience.'

This lays stress upon the supremacy of right. Here is no advocacy of obedience to a ruler just because he is one. The citizen is to obey the governor because he seriously believes that the edict is in accordance with righteousness.

It may be asked if Rome, not being a Christian empire, could be said to legislate in accordance with the Christian ethic since Paul was so wholehearted in support of it. The opening chapters of the epistle to Rome are instructive. 'When

the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness.' It would seem that the Roman Empire had wonderfully grasped that law of God, and had at the same time respect unto the individual conscience. Ramsay Muir says that it was able to effect 'a system of law so just and so flexible that it could be applied under widely different conditions: a *jus gentium* which represented the greatest common measure of the legal systems of many different peoples.'

Be that as it may; it was righteousness, administered by the State, and commending itself to the individual conscience, which had to be heartily obeyed.

Let us stress the fact that it has to be heartily obeyed, for surely, if the introduction of the fact of conscience emphasizes the supremacy of righteousness, so it does the importance of the individual personality with its liberty and responsibility.

The consent of conscience establishes an individual who should think for himself, and who should have the liberty to do so. The dictator denies this liberty. He dictates; and should the subject protest that he cannot conscientiously obey, he brushes conscience aside. The other government-authority issues his order, but when the conscientious objector lodges his objection, and can show that it is what he claims, and not merely a like or dislike, his conscience is respected. This seems to be Paul's position, and we can thank God that, with all her faults, Britain does maintain such a principle in her national custom.

This liberty, however, is a liberty to think, and should result in a keen sense of responsibility. We must wholeheartedly embrace and seek to execute what we see to be right. Said Henry Ward Beecher, 'Wherever I find truth, I will appropriate it, for it is an estray from God's Word, and belongs to me and to all.' It is this deliberate appropriation of right on the part of the citizen, prompted by a sense of responsibility, that counts. Without it, any state is weak, for there is no conviction to urge its people. Morris sums up the Roman situation as follows: 'We have seen that the Roman genius, while it succeeded in building up an empire which was a model of peaceful administration, had all the while been sapping the vital energy of the peoples under its rule.' Its citizens had enjoyed without thinking: they had accepted without conscientiously making their own.

If it is the right of the citizen to have his conscience respected, it is his responsibility to use it. If the enactments of the State commend themselves to our consciences we should heartily support them and seek to further them. It is the prerogative and responsibility of each citizen who is a Christian to think and to vote and to act.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Looking at You.

By the Reverend C. M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'Look not upon me. . . .'—Ca 1^6.

Some time ago a gentleman was being taken round a famous school by a somewhat inky little schoolboy who said to him as they walked along, '*We* have got six scholarships this year.' When the visitor duly inquired if he had been successful himself, he replied somewhat scornfully that he wasn't the kind of boy who would ever get a scholarship anywhere, and then he added, 'If you want to know what sort of a school this is, for goodness' sake don't look at me.'

Now, of course, nothing is more likely than that when others want to find out what sort of a school yours is they *will* look at you. After all, people never judge a school just by the number of prize-winners in it, they get their impressions of it from the boys and girls of it they meet. It's rather a responsibility, therefore, to wear your school badge or your school blazer, for you are an advertisement one way or other for your school. It is you who will show others something of its standards. It is your conduct which will commend it or otherwise. Someone after meeting a schoolboy remarked once in my presence, 'I'm sure that's the Ardvreck bow,' mentioning a certain school: so that his politeness reflected credit on his school. Such, then, is one lesson not to forget, that others will take their idea of your school from looking at you.

Similarly, now, looking at you lets others know something about what kind of a country yours is. I'm sure other nations will be sizing us, in Britain, up by what they see of our troops who are overseas. And what they hear of us in newspapers has an influence, too. In one newspaper the story was told of a little evacuee, seriously injured in an air raid on a south-west of England town, who, when being dug out of the debris calmly said, 'Come on, let's sing a bit.' Anyone reading that would think more of us as a race. One foreigner,

for instance, wrote after looking at an account of pluck like that, 'If I were an Englishman, I would indeed be proud to be an Englishman.' While an old black Mammy, after reading other such stories, remarked 'What it says in dis paper bout de British, sure makes me wish Ah wuz one.' Very truly, looking at you may make others think well or ill of your native land.

Again, looking at you lets others know something of the kind of Master you serve, that is to say, they may judge of Jesus Christ through seeing how we behave who call ourselves Christians and so claim to be His followers. As St. Paul said, we are 'Christ's epistles,' which means to say, His living letters, and people who look on us will expect to find in our character some resemblance to Him. A very wonderful Indian Christian, Sadhu Sundar Singh, was staying in our country once. At the house where he was there were twins, who made a friend of him at once. Next morning he had to depart before they were up, and when they got down to breakfast one of them asked:

'Mummy, where has Jesus gone?'

'Hush, dear,' Mummy said, 'that wasn't Jesus, that was Sadhu Sundar Singh.'

No, it wasn't Jesus, though the Sadhu wore flowing Oriental garments, as Jesus did; but there was something also about the Sadhu just like the goodness and the loveliness of Jesus. So I trust sincerely that when others look at you they will see, as in a true not a twisted mirror, something of the likeness of the Saviour you serve.

Not merely in the words you say,
Not only in your deeds confessed,
But in the most unconscious way
Is Christ expressed.

Is it a beatific smile,
A holy light upon your brow?
Ah, but I felt His presence while
You laughed just now.

And from your eyes He beckons me,
And from your heart His love is shed;
Till I lose sight of you—and see
The Christ instead.

Cabbages and Kings.

By the Reverend Rolf Gledhill, M.A.,
Edgbaston, Birmingham.

'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.'—Mk 8^{34} (R.V.).

The life of a sailor is always full of adventure. He has to be ready for any emergency. Long ago, in the days of sailing ships, there were far more difficulties; and every voyage was a hazardous exploit. And though the sailor could battle with strong winds, and bring his ship safely through strange seas, there was one danger he always feared. It was a dread disease called scurvy. Against this evil he seemed powerless. Every year it killed more sailors than were killed by shipwreck, or in battle, or by any other illness.

One of the greatest achievements in those days of sailing ships was a voyage round the world by Lord George Anson. He set out in 1741, and it was nearly four years before he returned home again. This great voyage brought him wealth and fame. Everyone admired his courage and endurance. But there is a sad side to his story. It was not all success. For on the voyage most of the crew died. This terrible plague had broken out on board his ship. It killed two-thirds of his men.

This disease did not only attack sailors. Everyone was subject to it, and it would sweep through a whole country spreading suffering and death. But at last the cure was found. And the name of the source of the cure is particularly interesting. It is the Cruciferæ. The word itself means 'cross-bearers': and it is the name given to one of the largest of the natural orders of plants. One of the best known of these Cruciferæ plants is the cabbage. This contains the principle of life—or vitamin, as we now call it—which destroys the disease. When green food such as cabbage was used, scurvy disappeared. So the dread evil was abolished by the Cruciferæ. The life-bringer was the 'cross-bearer.'

The story of Lord George Anson is only one of the many records of man's great triumphs. Right down the ages man has been setting out on great voyages of discovery. He has crossed many seas and discovered new lands. He has delved into the earth and found new treasures. In all his adventures man has won great achievements. But there is a sad side to his story. It is not all a tale of triumph. There is also a record of sorrow and suffering. And much of this is caused by the terrible scourge called sin. It has brought more unhappiness than anything else in the world. And against its attacks man seems powerless. It might also be called a 'deficiency' disease. If only sin could be overcome, new life and new joy would be possible for man.

Once again it was the Cross-bearer that was the life-bringer. In the hour of need the King of kings left the glories of His heavenly home, and came into our world, and lived our life; for us He suffered and died upon the Cross. His name, we are told, is Jesus 'because he shall save his people from their sins.'

Among the large number of plants that belong to this order called Cruciferæ there is not one that is poisonous. All are health-giving. All can be used to bring health and happiness to the world. But there is another order of Cruciferæ, an order instituted by Jesus Christ Himself. 'If any man would come after me,' He said, 'let him take up his cross and follow me.' Jesus calls us to be cross-bearers. He summons us through worship to join this great company, who, through Him, know the fulness of life. He bids us carry our cross, and be among the Cruciferæ. For by so doing, we are helping to heal the wounds of the world.

How do we carry the Cross? Jesus, our Leader, has given us the two rules. We must 'deny self'

and we must 'follow Him.' First, we must learn to say 'No' to all selfish thoughts and desires; and then we must follow Him in His way of prayer, and loyalty, and service. So shall we be worthy members of this noble band of Cross-bearers.

The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

What is Underneath?

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'And underneath . . .'—Dt 33^{27}.

What are you worrying about? What are you afraid of? What makes you so miserable that it brings you almost to the brink of a breakdown? The strange thing is that, half your time, you do not know. Sometimes you think you know. It is this or it is that. But you know that it cannot entirely be that or this. It is deeper, much deeper. It is underneath—and underneath.

What a psychologist Moses would have made—and was. 'God who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky.' Yes, it is well to know that we are guarded and guided from above. But that is not where our trouble comes from. It comes from underneath. It is when you look underneath, deep down into your own mind, or when the things that are underneath come up and begin to look at you, it is then that you begin to fear and brood. I am grateful that Moses remembered that—'and underneath.'

If you want to sail a ship you will have to learn navigation. That is, you will have to know all about what is around and beyond and above you, the sun and moon and stars, the currents and cross-currents and tides. But if that is all you know you will not sail your ship, or you will not sail it for long. You will have to learn oceanography, too. That is, you will have to know about what is underneath. There are currents on the surface—and underneath. There are rocks that come up from underneath to sea-level, but only just or not quite. And most treacherous of all are the sunken wrecks, some of them wanderers in the ocean's underworld, not entered on any map or marked by any buoy. Many a brave ship has come to grief through striking one of these uncharted wrecks—underneath.

What are we to make of the enigma of the great German race? You cannot name a branch of human art or science but there is, somewhere at the top, a cluster of illustrious German names. And what do we not owe to German theologians and reformers? And yet this gifted race has been, and still is, a curse to itself and a scourge to all. What of the German Reformation? Have not the German people been converted? Yes, but they were only half converted. That has been the trouble. It was a conversion under protest and by violence, and it left, underneath, a 'shock,' a collective neurosis. In other words, the old heathen gods and demons were never quite rooted out of the German mind. They have been coming along all the time slumbering underneath, waiting for the man and the moment in order to spring to life once more. The trouble has been there all the time—underneath. A good German Lutheran lived in a fine old house of which he was justly proud, but in the wall of this Protestant homestead there still stands out, for aught I know, the heathen emblem of the horse's head sacred to Wodan! And that's a parable. The trouble is underneath—and underneath.

And what of the still older enigma of the Hebrew race? An 'undisciplined mob'? Maybe; but these Children of Israel were a gifted race, so gifted that God singled them out for a unique task. But what a trouble they were to Moses! Very often they, too, were a menace to themselves and to others. What ailed them? Where lay the trouble? Let us dip into this old case-book and watch Moses as he tracks it down to its hidden lair—underneath.

Like a practised psychiatrist he lets his patients talk and at last they give themselves away. 'We remember,' they ramble on, 'the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick.' What a depraved taste! What a morbid craving! Had they not turned their backs upon Egypt? Were they not facing the Promised Land? Surely they had killed those cravings. Yes, but they had only half killed them. Those desires were dead. Yes, but they were only half dead. And still they come along, those half-conquered cravings, underneath.

Another time, in walking through the camp, Moses saw a ghastly sight. He saw what appears to have been a whole community in the throes of a nervous breakdown. 'And Moses heard the people weep throughout their families, every man in the door of his tent.' Why were they weeping? Very probably even they themselves could not have told. The truth is that, in the past, they had had a shock. Pardon a personal allusion. It still causes me uneasiness and even distress to hear the sound of footsteps following me for any length of time. I must either quicken my pace or let my follower pass on. And the reason is this: I once had a shock. During the last war some of us were moving along the Vladaja Ravine towards the frontier of Serbia. Suddenly a nest of machine guns opened fire upon us from behind up on the 'Pip Ridge.' I felt a little better when I had moved my equipment so that my water-bottle rested in the hollow of my back. That was a long time ago and I have conquered that fear. But I have only half conquered it. And it was that kind of shock which these Israelites once had. 'And the children of Israel lifted up their eyes, and, behold, the Egyptians marched after them; and they were sore afraid.' They had got over the shock, but they had only half got over it. They had conquered that fear, but they had only half conquered it, and here it is coming along with them underneath, an underflow of half-conquered fears. They say that time heals all wounds and that, in time, old sorrows are forgotten. No, they are only half forgotten. They

come along with us—underneath. Some psychologists say that when you get down to these things that are underneath, to the lower layers of the unconscious, to the region of the half-dead desires, half-conquered fears, half-forgotten sorrows, you are so deep down that there is nothing more underneath. But Moses knew better. He goes underneath what is underneath. And Moses is right: 'The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.'

What are you worrying about? What are you afraid of? What is it that keeps you awake at night so that you cannot go to sleep again? You do not know. Half your time you cannot tell. Desires that are only half dead. Fears only half conquered. Sorrows only half forgotten and sins only half repented. What are you to do when you feel yourself sinking through this mysterious underworld of the human spirit? One thing you must not do. You must not get into a panic. Do not try to struggle up out of it. Just let yourself sink down through it. Let yourself go, and trust, for underneath are the everlasting arms. Deeper than desire, deeper than fear, deeper than sorrow, deeper than sin is the love of God and the forgiveness of God and the grip of God—and underneath are the everlasting arms.

The most terrible, and the most glorious voyage of discovery into this world of the underneath was made by our Lord Himself on the Cross. Through those appalling layers of the things that are underneath He sank, through His sorrows, through His doubts, through His fears, through that dark and dreadful underworld of all the sins of the world, and as He sinks He cries, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' And underneath? What is underneath? 'Into thy hands I commend my spirit.' Yes, that is the Ultimate, beyond all our deepest soundings—and underneath are the everlasting arms.

When Ellen Terry was old and nearly blind, her friend, Mr. St. John Ervine, went to see her. 'As they led me up to her,' says Mr. Ervine, 'she said, "I can't see you. Let me feel your hands."' Will you say that to God? 'I can't see you. I can't see anybody. I can't see anything. Let me feel your hands.' That means trusting. That means falling—through your sorrows, through your fears, through your sins. Yes, but when you fall you will fall gently because you will fall into the hands of the living God. The eternal God is thy refuge, *and underneath* are the everlasting arms.

PALM SUNDAY.

The Power of Public Opinion.

BY THE REVEREND A. MENZIES, D.D., CAMPHILL, GLASGOW.

'And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.'—Mk 11^{9}.

'And they cried out again, Crucify him.'—Mk 15^{13}.

One of the major issues which Palm Sunday raises in our minds is the importance of public opinion. This at least possesses the merit of contemporary interest. 'I'll tell you,' said Felix Holt, 'what's the greatest power under Heaven, and that is public opinion—the ruling belief in society about what is right and what is wrong, what is honourable and what is shameful. That's the steam that is to work the engine. How can political freedom make us better any more than a religion we don't believe in, if people laugh and wink, when they see men abuse and defile it.' The modern world at any rate is under no delusion about the justness of this verdict. It acts on the assumption that the important thing in public policy is the control and manipulation of the propaganda machine. So much is this the case that the formation of the right kind of public opinion is reckoned to be one of the chief weapons in the armoury of modern warfare. Even in countries, democratically governed, a separate department of State has been created to direct Press and Radio news and views. The powers that be have made up their minds about the emotional and volitional effect of directed mass-suggestion. There is a certain State in India that has a make-believe Parliament. Men meet together, discuss and frame resolutions, and the ruling Rajah then proceeds to tear them up. When he was asked why he continued to countenance such an Assembly, he said, 'Those resolutions are first torn up and then acted upon. I myself always act upon them, because I feel I am but a straw in the current of public opinion.' The final decision in any controversy is always the voice of the people.

This truth shines with transparent clearness through the events which led up to the Crucifixion. On Palm Sunday Jesus was borne forward on a strong running tide of popular approval. The crowds strewed palm branches on His way, and with delirious enthusiasm acclaimed Him as the long-expected Messiah. Then the tide unaccountably ran back as swiftly in the opposite direction, and what to-day carried Him to triumph to-morrow swept Him to doom. Humanly speaking, it was this dramatic *volte-face* on the part of the people which sealed the fate of Jesus. 'So Pilate, willing to content the people, delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified.' All which raises certain sobering reflections in our minds.

We notice, first of all, this significant fact, that it is possible to harness public opinion to Christ and His Cause. We can easily exaggerate the alleged failure of Christ with the masses. The evidence of the Gospels seems to point the other way. We are told that 'the common people heard him gladly.' They marvelled at His gracious words. They were grateful for His works of mercy. On more than one occasion they would have taken Him by force and made Him a King. And on this Palm Sunday the ground of the complaint of the authorities was His popularity with the masses. 'Behold how ye prevail nothing: lo, the world is gone after him.' From time to time questionnaires are circulated by church authorities with a view to discovering the prevailing attitude

of the soldier in the trenches or the man in the street towards Christ and His religion. Almost uniformly the results of these investigations are depressing in the extreme. It is probably true what they claim, that the prevailing trend of our age is one of huge religious unconcern. But this attitude, serious though it be, is the poles apart from one of embittered and obdurate hostility. 'Like sheep,' said the prophet, 'they are going astray' heedlessly, not wantonly. The big unspoiled heart of humanity is not at enmity with Jesus. He is still for the masses 'the lonely greatness of the world.' His moral and spiritual beauty haunts them like a disturbing dream. His standards of conduct are still authoritative for them, even though they honour them in the breach rather than the observance. And if by the power of the same living Christ, some Lazarus-like miracle should be wrought in their midst, and their own souls or the souls of some one dear to them should be raised from the death of sin to eternal life, it will evoke a response from them such as will bind them for ever to Christ and His cause. The delirious enthusiasm of the crowds at Christ's entry into Jerusalem is the conclusive answer to any scepticism we may still have about the capacity of the masses to respond to Christ's call.

The other side of this question, however, needs equally to be pondered. One of the lessons of Palm Sunday, as well as one of its warnings, is that the public opinion sympathetic to Christ may equally become anti-pathetic. For public opinion, created under the pressure of mass-suggestion, is always fluid and inconstant, and liable to be stampeded in any direction desired. 'Bah,' said Napoleon, to Bourrienne, congratulating him on his ascendancy over the masses, 'this same unthinking crowd under a slight change of circumstances would follow me just as eagerly to the scaffold.' Was his mind, one wonders, running on that other event which once took place long ago 'outside a city wall'? Why did the crowd then blow hot and cold by turns? Why was the darling of the crowd's devotion to-day the victim of their execration to-morrow? The only explanation is that they had been got at in the interval. The Priestly propaganda had set to work and produced its deadly fruit. It had poisoned the minds of the people. It had perverted their judgment and thrown a smoke-screen over their eyes. It had adroitly insinuated the suggestion that Christ was the friend of Rome, the enemy of the people, the destroyer of the Temple, an iconoclast and charlatan and no true Messiah. By these means they roused the fanatical to frenzied hostility and the loyal to flaccid and nerveless inaction. It is thus that the wells of public life are polluted, and the power of public opinion harnessed to nefarious ends. Readers of *Mein Kampf* can master the technique for themselves, and in its successful application to the conditions of modern life they can assess its devastating power. It is only too possible, by the skilful use of the machine, to alter the outlook, values, and spiritual sympathies of nations in a single generation, almost without their awareness of the fundamental changes that are taking place. This alone can explain the dramatic change-over in the mind of the Jerusalem crowd, as it also furnishes the key to the spiritual apostasy of Europe. Those who wield the control weapons which mould public opinion will naturally tend to discredit a religion which conflicts with vested interests or cuts athwart the demands of power-politics.

It is at this point that the Christian Church has its own contribution to make to the task of creating an informed and enlightened public opinion. Her function is to stand forth as a solid breakwater against the mounting and menacing seas of mendacity and misrepresentation. It is to foster within its fellowship the love of truth, to stimulate its pursuit and secure its vindication. Fortunately it has its own channels, for attaining this end. On great questions of national policy it has its Courts, its public platform and its own Press. More intimately, yet no less potently, it has its worship, fellowship, and Sacraments. Let no one underestimate the coercive power of the ordinary means of grace in the formation of public opinion. What would a Communist not give to possess those living 'cells' of opportunity for the transmission of his Marxian Gospel? Yet perhaps the most potent weapon the Church possesses for this end is the quality of the type of mind it produces. The gentle Amiel in his *Journal* writes, 'A crowd is a material force, and the weight of numbers gives to a proposition the authority of law; but that *wise and ripened temper of mind* which takes everything into account is not engendered by the impetuosity of the masses.' It is the function of the Church to create 'that wise and ripened temper of mind' which is impervious to the bludgeonings of the mass-mind and refuses to be stampeded by popular catchwords and parrot propaganda. 'They say; what say they? Let them say.' It is this independent temper of mind, based on spiritual conviction, and controlled by God's Spirit, which multiplied indefinitely makes the Christian Church the light of the world and the saving salt of society.

Whether or no the Church can produce this Christ-controlled and self-propagating quality of life in sufficient strength to make its influence decisive on public life will settle the issue as to whether the public opinion of our land will be in the future pagan or Christian. To-day as two thousand years ago it will determine the momentous question whether Christ will be crowned the Lord of all good life or suffer the doom of being crucified afresh. That is one of the major lessons which the message of Palm Sunday inculcates.

EASTER DAY.

The Resurrection as an Experience.

BY THE REVEREND G. J. JEFFREY, B.D., POLLOKSHIELDS, GLASGOW.

'That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection.'—Ph 3^{10}.

Long before the Evangelists had committed to writing the details of the Resurrection for future generations to accept or reject, living evidences

of its supernatural power had been displayed to the world. A few impassioned men, in the sway of strange, new life forces they could neither understand nor resist, were winning the first victories of the crucified, risen Christ, were laying the foundations of the Christian Church, and were changing the currents of human history. Towering over them, striding ahead of them, luring them on, was Paul the Apostle, in whom the new resurrection life surged most mightily. Can we enter into 'the mind that was in Paul' and try to note some of the tokens and evidences of this wondrous life, for ever being renewed from sources unseen and eternal? Can we compare with his abysmal experiences in this region some of the most intimate of our own, shallower they may be, but to us more real and more convincing with the years? Can we, too, feel throbbing within us 'the power of his resurrection'?

Witness, to begin with, the Apostle, in the control of this new life, conscious that he had domesticated within him *a living, divine Personality*, an unseen Companion, inspiring, guiding, rebuking, bringing into his spiritual life new standards and criteria of living he felt himself powerless to resist. Again and again we watch him patently acting and thinking under the sway of this tremulous, powerful Intimacy. No one knew better than the Apostle the difference between the days when he was borne as on wings by this invading Companionship and the days when he was 'left to himself.' The least self-conscious of men, there were times when he could not but stand aside and watch this new, risen life surging up through his own life, using him to the uttermost and filling him with an awesome sense of its reality. Gradually 'the old man with his deeds' sank towards death and 'the new man in Christ Jesus' rose within him, glowing, expanding, triumphant.

Surely our own dim lives, in some measure, witness to this progressive transformation. Which of us but has intimations and intuitions of a new life rising within us on the ruins of the old, as spring rises out of winter?

This sense of the indwelling spirit of God within us, 'never letting us be and never letting us go,' has been powerfully set forth in the words of James Martineau: 'Whence but from Him, the vision that ever haunts us of a purer and more perfect order in our daily life—an order less indulgent to our ease, more faithfully accounting for our time, more fresh from our affections? Who is it that smites us to the heart when the petulant word has escaped the lips or the shameful indulgence degraded our will? It is not *we* that conduct all this sad strife and administer this deep experience. *We* neither fetch our own inspirations nor inflict our own retributions. It is a holier Spirit that broods near us and flings athwart us his shadow or his flash.'

If things like these go on within us, nay because a mystic intercourse with a divine, loving, searching Companion is our recurring experience, let us value it and make the most of it, as we would save our souls. Shall we not pray for a keen sensitiveness to this divine life which, ever and anon, betrays its presence within us by its flutterings and stirrings, its intuitions, its calls and recalls, its every rebuke, its every encouragement? Well we know whence come these voices.

> Often as thy inward ear
> Catches such rebounds, beware!
> Listen, ponder, hold them dear,
> For of God—of God they are.

Note again that this risen life within us, if it reveals itself in an exulting emotion, proves itself real in *a supernatural quality of service*, which even the cynical outsider cannot gainsay. Few studies in biography are more thrilling than the spectacle of one unsurmountable obstacle after another being swept aside as the sluices of this new life were opened in the breast of St. Paul. Before the onrush of this tide, closed doors open, enemies become friends, appalling situations yield ways of escape, even the humiliation of 'the thorn in the flesh' releases strange resources of power, sore imprisonment becomes blessed leisure to compose imperishable writings and the rigours of constant suffering build up within him a great, roomy, hospitable heart, wherein countless thousands of baffled folks have entered for rest and spiritual repair. 'Who is weak,' he exclaims, 'and I cannot feel for his weakness? Who is offended, and I cannot understand his burning indignation?'

None of us are men of the Apostle's calibre, nor shall we be used to mighty issues as he was, but we too have red-letter days of the soul which we can explain in but one way—that the risen life of Christ is at work within us, informing us, employing us, sending us forth conquering and to conquer. The proofs of Christ's Resurrection for some of us come, not by laboriously piecing together the narratives of the four Evangelists and surmising that, on the whole, the strong likelihood is that the rending of the rock-tomb really happened! Of that mighty event, with a quiet confidence we can neither explain nor explain away, we can say that of its truth 'we have the witness in ourselves.' To ministers and men alike, these blessed seasons come, periods of divine indwelling and divine empowering, when we know that, often as we are straitened in ourselves, we need never be straitened in God. It is then that for us the Resurrection of Jesus becomes no longer an insoluble problem for the reason, but a glowing principle of power in the life and in the heart.

Lastly, the Resurrection life within us convinces us that *there will be no break between such a life here and the life hereafter.*

Of one of my predecessors in my first charge, a young minister whose three brief years of earthly ministry were charged with strange, spiritual influence, a plain, thoughtful Elder once remarked to me: 'When he was among us, we felt that he was only half among us. The other half was in another world.' Are we not impressed on a grand scale with this twofold aspect of the life of St. Paul? His was a life lived *in* this world

and *for* it, engrossed 'to capacity' in its duties, its responsibilities, its sufferings, and yet clearly not *of* it, strangely detached, surmounting it, transcending it, his feet on earth, his citizenship in heaven. Conceive his life as it emerges for us in phrases like these from that fascinating translation 'St. Paul from the Trenches.' 'We dwell at ease and spaciously even whilst we are oppressed and afflicted.' 'The immortal life of Jesus has appeared in our bodies and we live immortal.' 'We are looking no longer on the surface of things: our inner eyes are fixed on the invisible.' 'The outer man is no more than a transitory tabernacle like that which the people carried through the wilderness, which can be furled up and laid aside for ever.'

Therein breathes the spirit of St. Paul, indwelt by the risen Christ. Here is one who, by reason of that indwelling, is no longer chained to time and sense, no longer estimating life by mere categories of pleasure and pain, exalted by the one, depressed by the other, but made sure and steadfast amid every variation of fortune, equal to every demand, able to abound or to suffer want, a man for whom every day was the same, a purifying process separating the dross from the silver, and out of all emerging at last—a soul bearing the stamp of immortality.

We too may have this stabilizing assurance that is born of the indwelling risen Christ. Using this world, enjoying its best gifts to the full, serving it to our utmost, we do not lean our weight on it. We cannot. We do not wish to. We are like

> The bird
> That pausing in her flight,
> Awhile on boughs too slight,
> Feels them give way beneath her
> And yet sings,
> Knowing that she hath wings.

Here, believe me, is no cowardly escape from this grim war-torn world to a world of self-centred pietism. That is the last charge that could be levelled at St. Paul and his like, with their abundant labours and sacrifices. It is only taking into account all the facts of our human conditions. It is only reckoning what lies on the surface of life and what keeps resounding from its unfathomable depths. It is taking to ourselves the eternal comfort of the gospel of the Resurrection whereby 'we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.'

First Sunday after Easter.

Contemplating the Dawn.

By the Reverend Spencer Wade, M.A., Whalton Rectory, Morpeth.

'We give thanks to God always for you all . . . remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, before our God and Father.'—1 Th 1^{2-3} (R.V.).

The Church of Christ is living through times of unprecedented stress and strain. Whatever the cause, or causes, fewer and fewer people are attending her Services or heeding her call. Many once faithful and loyal children of the Church are allowing themselves to forget her existence and seem to care little or nothing about her purpose and mission. Not a few devoted ministers are well-nigh heartbroken. Having themselves seen the Christ they would give all they have and are to induce their fellows to see that He is the only hope of mankind. Yet despite their conviction and efforts they witness young, middle-aged, and elderly alike hurrying along the road of life as if Christ had never lived, had never died and triumphed over death—utterly heedless of the One Companion without whom no human can hope to travel safely or with any prospect of reaching the destination appointed for man.

It is good for us all in times like the present to contemplate the dawn of the Church's existence, for it was a lovely dawn pregnant with promise. Paul, that indefatigable bond-servant of Christ, is addressing the first of his messages to the Churches 'to the assembly of Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.' He has no doubts that that small and motley group of Jews and pagans is 'in God,' that God is 'Father,' that Jesus is 'Lord' and 'Christ.' He is ebulliently thankful to God the Father, always, for all of them, bearing in mind continually, despite his innumerable calls, his many anxieties, and his unceasing efforts to propagate the good news, three outstanding characteristics of his converts—their work resulting from faith, their activity prompted by love, and their endurance sanctioned by hope 'in our Lord Jesus Christ in the presence of our God and Father.' Faith, hope, love—in that order. The Apostle was able to appreciate these gifts in his converts because they lay at the foundation of his own ministry.

These, it would seem plain, are precisely the gifts needed to-day by all those who, disappointed and anxious, are toiling to direct the steps of their fellows into the way of life.

1. First, faith—the faith that achieves. This is the first time that the word 'faith' occurs in the New Testament, and we must be careful not to read into it meanings which it gathered to itself in later days. Here it does not connote 'resting in God,' or passive trust. It implies that its possessors have ceased to place their confidence in the dead idols and have transferred their allegiance to 'the living and genuine God,' for the purpose of serving Him. It is not a faith (if there be such) that solves all the mysteries of life, and supplies clear-cut explanations of all life's problems. It is an attitude of the inner self toward God, first, then towards life and its difficulties. It does not so much solve problems as master them. Hartley Coleridge might have had in mind this phrase of the Apostle, 'work of faith,' when he uttered the well-known lines:

> Think not the faith by which the just shall live
> Is a dead creed, a map correct of heaven,
> Far less a feeling fond and fugitive,
> A thoughtless gift, withdrawn as soon as given,
> It is an affirmation and an act
> That bids eternal truth be present fact.

This first appearance of 'faith' conjoined with 'work' reveals how far the Apostle is removed from approving either a merely theoretical or sentimental faith. In his later Epistles he contrasts 'faith' and 'works,' that is, Pharisaic 'works of law,' supposed to be meritorious to earn salvation by right and as a matter of obligation on God's part. No such notions are in his mind here. Faith is an operative principle of life, a working power. It is a daily practical effort to master circumstances; and this is precisely what all servants of Christ need urgently to-day. They need to be up and doing, and achieving, inspired by their faith.

2. The next great phrase of our text is 'labour of love,' or 'the toilsome activity prompted by love.' It is a unique phrase, hewn out of the circumstances of the group of Thessalonian Christians.

There is a distinction to be drawn between 'work' and 'labour' (or toil). 'Work' calls attention to the thing done, the achievement; 'labour,' to the process of doing it, the pains and exertions that issue in achievement. The Apostle does not state precisely what form this 'toil' takes, because the readers knew well enough its nature; but, reading between the lines, we can see that it involved devoted service to fellow-believers, courageous attempts to persuade pagans to give up their idols for the acknowledgment of the one living and genuine God, loss of old friendships, and, in some cases, loss of means of livelihood, and much physical and mental suffering. Only love of their newly found God, and resultant love for their fellows could prompt them to toil on and ever, and sustain them in their efforts.

Such a burning love the Church of Christ, and each individual member of the Church, needs sorely in our times. We look about us and see our fellows ignoring the things which alone ultimately matter. We realize painfully how much they are missing. If only we could persuade them—either by our words or by our lives. . . . We cry with Faber:

> Souls of men! why will ye scatter
> Like a crowd of frightened sheep?
> Foolish hearts! why will ye wander
> From a love so true and deep?

But there are few to heed. Some industrious souls are tempted to relax. They have tried so often and apparently in vain. Have they not seen Jesus? He has journeyed with them, and has not their love for Him deepened with the days? Yes, they must keep on without flagging. Did not the Master Himself confront the same problems, the same apathy and ingratitude? There is no Apostle to thank God for their 'labour of love.' What of it? The Master knows and understands. Enough! Our fellows need us, even though all unconsciously. We must not let them down; we must not let Him down.

3. 'Remembering your patience of hope,' or, 'your endurance inspired by hope.' Here there is no suggestion of resignation, of the acquiescent folding of hands, but rather of the 'patient continuance in good work.' It means carrying on when there is nothing left but the will to carry on. The phrase is better understood in the light of Milton's constancy that 'bears up and steers right onward' than in his 'They also serve who only stand and wait.' Nor is the hope which inspires endurance hope in the abstract; it is a hope whose object is Christ as Lord in the presence of God the Father, the hope of salvation here and hereafter. Only hope thus firmly based can inspire perseverance despite all obstacles in the path.

This is the third great need of the Church to-day. Our circumstances are indeed disheartening. Not only have thousands turned their backs on Christ; they cannot see that their having done so has led them and the world into the maelstrom in which we find ourselves whirling. The allied nations may, probably will, win this war, which has driven so many from their moorings; but what hope have we that our children's children will not be engaged, within a few years, trying to win another and worse war—if that be possible? What hope can we have of a new and wholesome order of life when this sorry business is over? Is there any sane man who imagines that politics will create a better world? Only by returning to Christ as Lord can men get back on to the road that leads to life indeed. If the world does not realize this, the Church does, and every member of the Church must abide true to his principles and keep on serving, and, by his unwearying service, persuading, inspired by hope in Christ.

In the demeanour of these early Christians we witness the Christian life being lived in its simplest and most abiding elements, a faith which had its outward effects upon their lives, a love that spent itself in the service of God and fellowmen, a hope that was no transient feeling, but was content to endure 'till the day break.' This must be our demeanour to-day.

> Spirit of God, who didst endow
> Thy Church on fair Thessalia's shore
> With gifts sublime,
> Grant to Thy Church which battles now
> The same three boons (we crave no more)
> To meet our time.
>
> Grant her the faith which never fails,
> That trusts her Lord, though He should slay,
> Or hide His face;
> A glowing faith that e'en prevails
> To work, when night blots out the day,
> Thy works of grace.
>
> Grant her the love which knows no fear,
> And loves when love reaps no reward
> To ease her load;
> That toils and sweats, when toil is drear,
> In storm and stress, 'gainst fire and sword,—
> Calvary's road!
>
> Grant her the hope which sees, though blind,
> The stars set in abysmal murk
> Of dread and doubt;
> That perseveres, though heart and mind
> Be sick, sure that her Lord will work
> His purpose out.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Evil and Suffering.

'For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.'—Ro 8^{18}.

The evil in the world, and still more the innocent suffering, are among the greatest obstacles to belief in God. They raise deep questions to which there are many replies, but no complete answer. But any religion, which is to hold the allegiance of men unwilling to buy inward peace at a price which moral reason cannot pay, must have some answer to these questions. The Christian religion has an answer, if not a wholly satisfactory theory—a practical answer sufficient for reasonable faith, which can then be verified by living in faith.

It will be found that much of the Old Testament is unconscious of these deep questions. The early Hebrew belief was that goodness is rewarded by prosperity, and sin punished by disaster.

There are reasons why the difficulties were not felt earlier. First, modern individualism, with its sense of the worth and rights of the individual person, was unknown to the early Hebrews. That the people were of one blood was taken literally, and consequently the sense of solidarity was so strong that the tribe or nation, not the individual, was the unit. As it was certain that there were always some who had transgressed against God, there was no problem when the suffering fell on those who were not openly indifferent to or rebellious against Him.

Ezekiel explicitly denied that God ever punished one man for the sins of another, but he only revised the old doctrine; he taught that goodness and well-being, sin and suffering, were fairly adjusted for each individual—and in this life. That is contradicted by experience, and Job rightly rejected it.

Nevertheless, in the older theory, beneath the crude conceptions of its working, there was important truth. Not, indeed, as direct punishment by God, but by what we call heredity and social environment, the sins of parents and others do involve our children in handicaps, hardships, and sufferings; and in the 'Servant-poems' in the Book of Isaiah there is at least this much truth, that in realizing our true place in the life of the community, by sharing the sufferings of others, and helping one another's infirmities, good can be brought out of evil. It is when men just look on at the world's pain, and do nothing to help, that they most easily think that God does likewise.

Now, the Christian believer cannot pretend that evil and suffering are anything other than we know them to be; indeed, sensitiveness to their reality is increased as men come to share the divine compassion of Jesus. Christians agree with Thomas Hardy that 'If way to the Better there be, it exacts a full look at the Worst.' Their sure and certain hope of victory, that all except sin is worth while, is in the last resort an act of faith, not an item of knowledge. But it is not a baseless faith, and its grounds may be briefly indicated.

We cannot go behind the judgment, in which all good men agree, that the best thing the world affords is disinterested goodness, with its crown of personal love. If it be granted that one of God's purposes may be the moulding of persons who, through conflict with evil and hardship and endurance in pain, shall have been purified as silver and have learnt to refuse the evil and to choose the good, then our world is not ill adapted to that purpose. If there were no need or pain there would be no effort, and therefore no progress, no attainment, no anything truly good—just stagnation.

If God is love, and seeks the free response of disinterested love from spirits who have learnt that therein is their own highest good, such a purpose cannot be realized by forcing men to love, or by sweeping away those evils which result from their failure to love. A world arranged to safeguard our well-being at every turn could not be a settled order of Nature *and also* realize the intelligence, foresight, prudence, and moral goodness which we confess to be of highest worth.

This throws light on what for many is the greatest difficulty, namely, the apparently haphazard sufferings, the terrible calamities, with which Nature abounds. Some of them serve useful purposes, and therefore, if bad, are good for something: others are not. But it is not necessary to regard them as directly willed by God. If He wills a settled order of Nature which ministers to moral life, the non-moral calamities seem to be by-products unavoidable in an evolutionary world. That there could be one without the other the Christian may ask the unbeliever to prove. Fire and heat cannot have all the properties which are beneficial to us and yet be unable to destroy us. God, through communion with Him, may once and again guide men to actions which avert calamities; but His intervention, on the scale necessary to save us from earthquake, plague, and all painful events, would change the world order into a meaningless chaos in which we could discover no probabilities, gain no prudence, predict nothing, form no habits, win no reliable knowledge. It is the regularity which God appoints, not the particular ills which, so far as we can see, are its inevitable accompaniments. That this is so often ignored shows how hard it is for us to reason calmly about matters which excite deep feeling.

Again, though suffering does not always ennoble character, it certainly often does so. He who taught men that the love of God numbered the hairs of their head did not lead an easy, comfortable life; He endured in a terrible form many of the things which cause men to deny the love of God. Christians learnt to say not only that He was made perfect through suffering, but to feel that through Him there had come into the world a power sufficient to work man's salvation. We may well doubt whether there is worth or wisdom in rejecting His teaching until we are sure that we have seen the world and life through

His eyes, and met their challenge and sufferings in His spirit.

The doctrine of life after death, if we have other grounds for holding it than that it is required to redress the wrongs of this life, throws further light on the problem of pain and evil. It means that this world is man's starting-point, not his goal. It is not that we demand compensation; it is rather that in this life, in spite of pain and evil, we can already discern enough to trust God's world purpose to be one of love. Because the world ministers to reasonable moral and spiritual life, it is reasonable to trust that such life will not be blotted out in everlasting death.

Finally, to those who hold the Christian doctrine about Jesus, and regard Him as the supreme revelation of God in terms of human life, His sufferings do not represent a short interlude in God's eternal life of unbroken enjoyment: they mean that God Himself shares in the world's pain, and through it works the world's redemption. This sheds a flood of light on the dark mystery of pain for all who recognize the life of Jesus to be the highest life and to reveal the most real values in the universe.

Thus, in confident faith, the Christian believes that, having fought evil and pain by every means consistent with righteousness, if the inevitable be endured bravely with a refusal to be embittered by it, in its last phase it is the meeting place with eternal joy; and that death, where the mystery is darkest and of which all suffering is a foreshadowing, is the gateway to fuller and better life. The great inspiration of early Christianity was a conviction that on one occasion when evil had done its worst, 'the heavens were not silent.' Christ's victory over death is the pledge of victory for all who are His; that is, for all who do not, to some evil intent, reject Him. That is faith, not knowledge; but in that faith the true Christian tries to live and in that faith will he die.[1]

[1] J. S. Bezzant, in *Sermons of the Year*, 1932, p. 62.

The Christian Assurance of Immortality.

By Professor Norman V. Hope, B.D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

In a previous article in this journal (August 1941) the suggestion was made that now—with war taking its grim toll of human lives—is the time for Christian preachers to proclaim their faith in the life to come. Of course, it must be admitted that there always have been, and still are, a few men and women to whom life after death is not desirable. Algernon Charles Swinburne, the well-known nineteenth-century English poet, expressed this attitude as follows:

> From too much love of living,
> From hope and fear set free,
> We thank with brief thanksgiving
> Whatever gods may be
> That no life lives for ever,
> That dead men rise up never,
> That even the weariest river
> Winds somewhere safe to sea.
> ('The Garden of Proserpine.')

More recently, Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith, the eminent literary critic, in his autobiography, entitled *Unforgotten Years*, echoes the same sentiment: 'We are indeed leaves that perish, as Homer told us long ago. I do not find that a fate to be regretted; to ask for a greater length of years would be to solicit the almost certainty of many miseries; and for any other form of being I feel no longing. All that I have read about what happens in a future existence makes the life beyond the grave seem an uncomfortable adventure. I have no desire for eternal bliss. And in the meantime I am able to enjoy, and I much enjoy, what Walt Whitman described as "old age flowing free, with the delicious nearby assurance of death"' (p. 275).

But the great majority of healthy-minded men and women in every age and generation have taken the attitude expressed so poignantly a few years ago by Dr. Bronislaw Malinowski, the famous anthropologist, in a wireless talk. This is what he said: 'Personally, to me, and to those many who are like me, nothing really matters except the answer to the burning questions, "Am I going to live on, or shall I vanish like a bubble?"; "What is the aim, and the sense, and the issue of all this strife and suffering?"' (*Science and Religion: A Symposium*, 78).

What grounds, then, are there for belief in immortality? What assurance does Christian faith have of its reality?

On this important question physical science is quite neutral: it can neither affirm nor deny personal immortality. For this belief is, in the nature of the case, not such as to admit of any formal proof of the kind that is valid in mathematics or logic. To be sure, attempts have sometimes been made to rule out of court this belief in life after death, on grounds which purported to be scientific. For example, not many years ago mind was declared to be purely and simply a function of matter. Man's power to think, it was said, depends upon a merely physical something called the brain. Disease, which impairs the one, deranges the other; and when death comes it makes a final end of both. Stated thus, this argument looks very plausible as well as scientific. But in fact it depends on an assumption which no science in the world can ever prove, the assumption, namely, that the relation between mind and brain, spirit and body, is a causal one.

That is to say, this crude materialistic logic assumes that the brain produces mind and consciousness, just as a kitchen fire will produce steam when a kettle of water is boiled on it. But this is quite unprovable; indeed, as an eminent modern man of science has declared, 'the materialistic assumption that the life of the soul ends with the life of the body is perhaps the most colossal instance of baseless assumption that is known to the history of philosophy' (quoted by Dr. George Jackson in *British Preachers*, iii. 265).

Of recent years assurance as to life after death has been sought through Spiritualism. Spiritualism is a movement which seeks by such methods as table-rappings, automatic writings, and trance mediumship, to establish communication with the spirits of the departed. There cannot be any doubt that this movement has done much to convince certain men and women of the reality of the unseen and of the existence of life beyond the curtain of death; for instance, the late Sir Arthur Conan Doyle was converted to this belief in life after death from a complete materialism. And some Christian ministers have expressed sympathy with this movement, *e.g.* Dr. Norman Maclean of St. Cuthbert's Parish Church, Edinburgh, and Canon Harold Anson, Master of the Temple. But many earnest seekers have been able to find no satisfying assurance in Spiritualism. Their objections are mainly three in number. For one thing, they cannot reconcile themselves to the methods employed, which seem suspect by reason of the darkness in which, in the main, they are carried out, and also because of the very large percentage of mediums who have been proved to be fraudulent. Again, the messages which purport to have thus come from the spirit world have been mainly trivial and inane, if not positively repulsive. For instance, the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, in an appendix to his book, *After Death*, examines from this point of view the alleged communications from the spirit world contained in the late Sir Oliver Lodge's well-known volume, *Raymond*. After a careful scrutiny of this evidence, Mr. Weatherhead comes to this conclusion: 'Supposing the communications are genuine and reliable, a world is painted for us which all our instincts deny to be the final home of our spirits; and to which, if its existence could be proved, we should certainly not want to go.' Thirdly, it has been contended that the alleged communications can be explained on other than spiritualistic grounds. As the Rev. E. T. Vernon says in his book, *Beliefs of To-day*, 'On the whole, considering the powers and possibilities which are being discovered in human nature, the far-reaching spheres that are open to telepathy, suggestion, thought transference, and the unknown contents and resources stored up in the unconscious mind, it becomes difficult to resist the conclusion that all the facts which Spiritualism lays before us are likely to be but further manifestations of the unexplored activities of the powers of incarnate personalities' (p. 105).

Assurance as to the life to come has been sought in this way, tha the incompleteness of this earthly life seems to necessitate it. Human life, at its best at least, cannot possibly unfold itself completely, cannot possibly develop to its full stature, in the course of its earthly existence —even though the length of that span may exceed the Psalmist's measure of threescore years and ten. This applies, for example, to the human mind and its capacities. Consider the case of John Keats, the English poet, who was carried off by tuberculosis before reaching the age of twenty-six, 'just as he really promised something great,' as Byron said. Or take a man like Mozart, the great composer, who, after producing immortal music, passed away before reaching the age of thirty-six. Of him the world-famous musical critic, the late Sir Donald F. Tovey, said this: 'In his "Requiem," that most pathetic of unfinished monuments, Mozart was forming a new style which might have transcended everything we know of him.' How irrational it would be to suppose that death could snuff out such men as Keats and Mozart for good and all, with their magnificent powers just ripening into bloom! But this consideration applies even to men who have reached the normal length of human life. Victor Hugo, the French novelist, after writing many great books, in his seventieth year said this: 'Winter is in my head, but spring is in my heart. For half a century I have been writing, but I feel I have not said a thousandth part of what is in me.' And Goethe, the greatest German writer, in his eighty-third year wrote this to a friend: 'I am delighted to find that even at my great age ideas come to me, the pursuit and development of which would require another lifetime.'

This incompleteness is true, not merely of human powers of mind, but also of human affections as well. 'Love,' says Dr. George A. Buttrick, of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, 'will not believe that love is nothing but ashes and tears.' And he goes on to quote from Theodore Watts-Dunton's novel, *Aylwin*, a passage in which the hero, Hal, hears his bereaved father declare with passionate conviction: 'Should you ever come to love as I have loved, you will find that materialism is intolerable—is hell itself—to a heart that has known a passion like mine. You will find that it is madness, Hal, madness, to believe in the word "never." You will find that you dare not leave untried any creed, however wild, that offers the heart a ray of hope.'

Such considerations as these lend colour to the late John Fiske's affirmation that 'to deny the everlasting persistence of the spiritual element in man would rob the whole process of its meaning. It would go far to putting us to permanent intellectual confusion. For my part, therefore, I believe in the immortality of the soul as a supreme act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work.'

Now it is not deniable that such an argument has both a personal and a philosophical appeal. But it must be frankly admitted that it has not

been found entirely convincing by all who have thought deeply about the matter. Says Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson: 'We really are not in a position to say that this or that individual life is eternally indispensable for the rational or moral justification of the universe. And as to waste, nature is prodigiously wasteful; and what losses the world-process may involve we cannot estimate or judge' (*Essentials*, 236–7).

The final—and specifically Christian—assurance of immortality includes what has been said about the incompleteness of human life; but it takes its stand fundamentally on the character of God. It approaches the question from the divine rather than from the human side. This was the method employed by Jesus Christ when He was challenged on this issue by the Sadducees, who flatly disbelieved in any kind of life after death (Mk 12^{18-27}). God, He said—and by God, of course, He meant the Supreme Being who created and who sustains and controls this universe—is a God of individual persons, with whom He enters into fellowship; and such fellowship, begun in this life here, He will not allow death to interrupt, or to impair in any way; rather, it will be deepened and enriched after death. Says Professor John Baillie: 'The argument is unanswerable; and is indeed the only unanswerable argument for immortality that has ever been given, or ever can be given. It cannot be evaded except by a denial of the premises. If the individual can commune with God, and if he matters to God, he must share God's eternity. For if God really rules, He cannot be conceived as scrapping what is precious in His sight. It is in this conjunction with God that the promise of eternal life resides' (*And the Life Everlasting*, 163).

Dr. Carnegie Simpson puts the matter thus: 'The real question is whether, behind all life, not only is a Cosmic Force which works out impersonal processes of reason, but is One *who cares for persons*, and so cares for them as to care eternally. Jesus based faith in immortality directly, and indeed solely, on this. When challenged on the problem He did not, as Socrates so wonderfully did, discuss the soul. He began to speak about God, saying that God is a God of individual persons, and, moreover, not of dead people but of living, and that they "live in Him." And when Jesus Himself came to die, He met His dark and bitter death saying, "Father, into Thy hands." The whole assurance of immortality, whether for ourselves or for those dear to us, lies in that single word. If that be a true name for God—and this is the very meaning of religion as Christianity understands it—then, certainly, death will not be allowed to have the last word about His children' (*Essentials*, 238).

Not only did Jesus Christ expound this unanswerable argument for immortality: but He actually Himself rose from the dead. Now it is sometimes supposed that His resurrection is the ultimate basis of the Christian's hope of life after death. But if the argument of this article has been followed and accepted, it will be realized that Jesus Christ's resurrection is not the final ground of hope; for it is itself grounded in a reality still more ultimate, namely, God's almighty love, which would not allow Jesus to be 'holden of death.' Yet, as the late Dr. H. R. Mackintosh so well says: 'While the resurrection of Jesus is not the final resting-place of thought, the place it fills in the array of evidences is crucial. The experience of Jesus was a test case, and, like every test case, it fixed a principle. It did not create that principle; yet it decided what it should mean for the world. We know that men are brave; but to see an act of heroism wonderfully quickens the knowledge. In like manner, he whom God is holding by His right hand is sure of life without end, but the spectacle of Jesus' actual resurrection gives to his prior faith a new intensity of feeling. It makes his hold upon it more living, so that he dares to apply it undismayed to the darkest aspects of experience—to sorrow, to tragedy, to ignominy and pain. The world is now transfigured in his eyes' (*Immortality and the Future*, 178).

Such is the Christian assurance of immortality, or rather, of eternal life. It is an assurance which has nerved and inspired the followers of Jesus Christ in every age. And it will enable their successors of to-day not only to bear up and to endure, but even to be more than conquerors, amid the tragic and terrible circumstances in which their lot is cast.

Contributions and Comments.

Baptism for the Dead.

THE custom of baptism for the dead to which St. Paul alludes in 1 Co 15^{29} has long been a difficulty to expositors, a 'crux interpretum.' It reads: 'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?' (R.V.). Numerous attempts have been made to explain this reference but none of them is very satisfactory.

1. Luther writes: 'They had themselves baptized among the graves of the dead as a sign that they certainly believed that the dead who lie thus buried, and over which they are baptized, would 'rise again.' He thus takes ὑπερ τῶν νεκρῶν as 'over the dead,' which linguistically is possible, but otherwise carries little support in sense or fact.

2. Calvin explains it thus. 'Those also were in fact baptized who did not expect to live long, but had death in front of them.' Here he takes

ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν to mean 'as those about to die.' This is linguistically strained, and has not commended itself widely, though A. E. Krauss transliterates the verse with a somewhat similar meaning. 'What is the sense of being baptized into a community which, if there is no resurrection, would be a community of the dead, owing to the daily dangers its members are exposed to?' Thus ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν is taken to mean 'Those in deadly peril.'

3. There have been attempts to spiritualize the meaning (cf. Hofmann) by taking ὑπερ τῶν νεκρών to mean 'for those dead in sin'; but the context is against such an interpretation.

4. The more general tendency has been to take the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν in its literal sense as 'on behalf of those who have died'; and to refer to some custom of vicarious baptism, the living on behalf of the dead. Vicarious rites for the dead are not unknown in that period (cf. those performed by Judas Maccabæus, the Dionysian rites, etc.) and actual vicarious baptism is said to have been practised later on amongst some in Marcionite and Montanist circles.

On the face of it, vicarious baptism seems to be mere superstitious magic; and this is Calvin's difficulty, to know how Paul could use the fact of such a superstitious custom as an argument for the Resurrection, as though to prove a truth by an untruth. Karl Barth realizes this difficulty, and though accepting on the whole that it must mean vicarious baptism, he concludes, 'I should be the first to rejoice if a more satisfactory explanation of this passage in a credible manner be forthcoming.'

I want to suggest that the main difficulty of our understanding the passage is that we generally conceive baptism as connected primarily with entrance into the Christian Church, whereas in apostolic days the reference was primarily to entrance into the Kingdom of God, in the Resurrection age. A crucial passage is Ro 6^{4-5}, 'Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.' Baptism is thus the pledge of resurrection, into the coming Kingdom of God; and this is shown by the close connexion between water baptism and Spirit baptism.

The Spirit in the New Testament stands for the Agent of the proleptic manifestation of the powers of the future Kingdom of God in this present age. (See Expository Times, Nov. 1939, pp. 89–90; and April 1941, pp. 270–275 for use of term 'Proleptic.')

Proleptic Baptism.

The baptism of John may be described as proleptic, that is, in anticipation of the advent of the Messiah. The meaning apparently is that those receiving water baptism at the hands of John would also receive Spirit baptism by the Messiah at His advent, would thus escape the judgment of the Day of Yahweh, and be sealed for entrance into the coming Messianic kingdom. The disciples of John did not need to wait for baptism until the Messiah was manifested; they could be baptized proleptically, since the direct reference was not to anything in the time series, but to the Kingdom of the new age (cf. Mk 1^{8}; Ac 19^{1-6}).

Kataleptic Baptism.

If proleptic baptism is possible, then why not kataleptic baptism under the reverse circumstances? In Judaism and in Early Christianity the family was conceived as a unit (1 Co 6^{16}). The faith of one partner affects the status of the other also. 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband' (1 Co 7^{14}). Where such a circle of ideas prevailed, the question would naturally arise in the minds of new believers. 'What about my dead husband? my dead wife? my dead children? Are they to be debarred from the resurrection into the coming Kingdom? If husband and wife are "one flesh," and if baptism is the sign and seal of resurrection into the Kingdom, should not the living husband be baptized for his dead wife; or the living wife for her dead husband; or the living parents for the dead children?'

Baptism for the dead therefore is not just a question of vicarious baptism, as it would be if the primary reference were to membership of the Church community; but rather a matter of kataleptic baptism, since the primary reference is to the resurrection into the coming Kingdom. In baptism the time factor is secondary; the resurrection factor, beyond time, is primary. Such a custom therefore would be an explicit demonstration of belief in the Resurrection, and as such could be used by Paul as an argument for such belief.

H. V. Martin.

Anantapur, South India.

In the Text of 1 Peter ii. 17 is πάντας τιμήσατε a Primitive Error for πάντα ποιήσατε?

In certain passages of 1 Peter conjectural emendations have been proposed, some of which have found a place in the footnotes of Dr. Erwin Nestle's edition of the *New Testament in Greek* (1932). This passage is not among them. The possibility of its unsoundness has, perhaps, never been seriously entertained. If it is unsound, the case must be one of primitive error in Hort's sense of the term, as MS. evidence seems to be all in favour of the existing text, except that the first hand of Cod. ℵ has πάντες instead of πάντας.

But there are grounds for suspecting error in πάντας τιμήσατε. The commentators betray some uneasiness in their explanations. Leighton allows

that honour in the narrower sense is not a universal due to all, but peculiar to some kinds of persons, as in Ro 13^{7}, 'Honour to whom honour is due,' and in the present verse the honour particularly due to Cæsar. 'But,' he adds, 'there is something that goes not unfitly under the name of honour, generally due to every man without exception.' Bengel interprets *πάντας* as 'omnes, quibus honos debetur. Ro 13^{7}.' Alford translates 'Give honour to all men' and takes the meaning to be, 'in every case render promptly every man's due'=*ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφειλάς*, Ro 13^{7}. Hort, in his unfinished commentary on 1 Peter, has a long note on this passage, too long for quotation in full. I quote one sentence. '*πάντας τιμήσατε* stands in contrast to *τῆς κακίας*. It expresses the opposite of the churlish and contemptuous feeling the indulgence of which would pervert all the relations of the Christians to the heathen.' This may be true, but it is hardly consistent with the meaning which *τιμάω* must bear when applied to the Emperor.

'Honour all men . . . Honour the king' is a rather strange sequence. In the Greek it is stranger still, *πάντας τιμήσατε . . . τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶτε*. Moreover the two intervening commands, *τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε*, *τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε*, have a common feature uniting them with the fourth command, namely the use of the present imperative. It is remarkable that the first command is distinguished by the use of the aorist, which is not fully accounted for by the desire to avoid ambiguity.

The question of punctuation has to be considered. Did the writer intend a period after *δοῦλοι*? Or did he intend a stop after *τιμήσατε* instead? If *πάντας τιμήσατε* should be construed closely with the words of *v.*[16], is a better sense obtained? 'As free, and not as having your freedom for a cloke of evil, but as bondmen of God, honour all men.' This does not harmonize with the reference in *v.*[15] to muzzling the ignorance of foolish men. Recent translators treat *v.*[16] as complete in itself. Dr. Moffatt has 'Live like freemen,' etc. Weymouth has 'Be free men,' etc. A parallel to this would be Marcus Aurelius vi. 30, *πάντα ὡς Ἀντωνίνου μαθητής*, where some such word as *ποίει* or *ποιεῖν* is understood. Thus we are brought to the verge of considering the proposed conjectural emendation of the text, and to this we now turn our attention.

It is probable that a new sentence begins with *ὡς ἐλεύθεροι*. A study of the preceding context leads to this conclusion. Not only does *ἐλεύθεροι* introduce a new idea, but it is not syntactically related to the previous verse. If we assume that *πάντας τιμήσατε* has by a scribal error displaced *πάντα ποιήσατε*, we are provided with a due completion of the sentence on lines suggested by the aforesaid translations. 'Do all things as free men,' etc.

I submit that *πάντα ποιήσατε* fits, alike in thought and expression, both the immediate and the wider context. What is the writer chiefly emphasizing in the whole preceding passage beginning at *v.*[11]? Is it not *καλὴ ἀναστροφή* in relation to the heathen, confuting by *ἀγαθοποιΐα* their conception of the Christians as *κακοποιοί*? *ὡς ἐλεύθεροι . . . πάντα ποιήσατε* has the impressiveness of a climax, the aorist imperative sharpening the edge of the exhortation in accordance with the tone of urgency which the writer constantly expresses in this way. By the succeeding present imperatives he is inculcating states of mind in a calmer tone.

For the use of *πάντα ποιεῖν* in N.T. compare 1 Co 9^{23} and 16^{14}, Ph 2^{14}, Col 3^{17}. In Pr 24^{72} (LXX) we find *μετὰ βουλῆς πάντα ποίει*. This may have been in the writer's mind, as apparently were the words *φοβοῦ τὸν Θεόν, υἱέ, καὶ βασιλέα.* (*Ib.* 24^{21}.) Compare also Ja 2^{12}, *οὕτως ποιεῖτε ὡς διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι.*

A striking parallel alike in form and matter is afforded by the writer himself in $1^{14.\,15}$. *ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς . . . ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε.*

πάντα ποιεῖν occurs several times in the Discourses of Epictetus, *e.g.* $4^{1.\,46}$, *τί γάρ ἐστιν, ὃ ζητεῖ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος; . . . πάντα ὡς θέλει ποιεῖν.*

1 P 2^{17} is not quoted by any of the Apostolic Fathers, but Clemens Romanus uses the rare words *ἀδελφότης* and *ἀγαθοποιΐα*, and shows other traces of our Epistle, *e.g.* 30^{1}, *Ἁγίου οὖν μερὶς ὑπάρχοντες ποιήσωμεν τὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ πάντα, φεύγοντες καταλαλιάς.* Lightfoot compares 1 P 1^{15} and 2^{1}. If the proposed conjecture is right, *ποιήσωμεν . . . πάντα* would be an additional trace.

Finally, if *πάντας τιμήσατε* has displaced *πάντα ποιήσατε*, how did it happen? In the papyrus script of that period certain letters were sometimes joined together. In this case *π* was so written as to be practically indistinguishable from *τι*. The scribe read, as he thought, *τι*. His eye fell upon *τιμᾶτε*, and he wrote *τιμ* by anticipation, substituting it for *ποι*, so that the word *ποιήσατε* was replaced by *τιμήσατε*. As the latter gave an intelligible meaning, it was accepted by the next copyist with the slight addition of *ς* to *πάντα* and in the course of transmission became established as part of the sacred text. Printers are subject to similar *lapsus mentis*, and instances might be quoted from modern printed books.

JAMES P. WILSON.

Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

Bernard Lord Manning.

B. L. Manning was one of the most remarkable dons Cambridge has seen for a long time. A loyal Congregationalist, he was a ritualist in his bones; he held that we were all rooted in the Mediæval Church; he loved the Chapel of Jesus College and seldom missed Evensong there. At his death requiems were said for him at Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic altars. Yet he was a convinced Calvinist and felt a 'call' to the Congregationalist ministry, though it was never realized. These different strains appear in various ways in the admirable biography by Mr. F. Brittain, M.A., like Manning a Fellow of Jesus College—*Bernard Lord Manning* (Heffer; 7s. 6d. net). We may select as illustrations of Manning's many-sided mind what he says on Reunion, the Reformation, and Dissent.

Reunion. 'There is a present danger, an urgent danger, that all that we of the Three Dissenting Bodies have stood for may be lost, because everyone nowadays wants to be courteous and no one wants to be awkward. The better our general relations with Anglicans are, the more we must regret our ecclesiastical separation. It would be so "nice" if we could all receive the sacrament together, *so* "nice." Well, niceness is not a main object of the Christian religion; and all this preaching in one another's pulpits and occasional illicit inter-communion, if it whets our appetites for the sweets of reunion at *any cost*, may betray the holy churchmanship which we received from our fathers.'

The Reformation. 'The Church in the Reformation was attempting in a slightly new way to discharge its unchanging task, the task of obeying the command, "Feed my sheep." The Reformers believed that they could do this better than churchmen had done it for some centuries, and they relied on two main processes: first, they would remove from the Christian scene many unnecessary things which obscured the essentials; second, they would lay a new emphasis on the essentials . . . Protestantism, that is to say, is not the opposite of mediæval catholicism: it is simply an improved kind of catholicism. Protestantism is not a negative thing. It is a positive restatement of catholic truth.'

Dissent. 'We are Dissenters, not from the doctrines of the Prayer Book, but from the doctrines of all modern civilization; from those heresies which have contaminated the Church and ruined the world; from the belief that Christianity is simply the top-stone of culture; from that short-sighted view which assumes that happiness comes by making the best of the world instead of by renouncing it and all its methods; that blind optimism which trusts in some magical law of progress, which sits down to watch shell-fish develop into men by way of sea-monsters and then hopes that men will develop into angels by way of social reformers. From all such nonsense we utterly dissent.

'The true Dissenter alone has a right not to be dumbfounded by this shattering of Europe; he alone has an honest right to say: "I told you so." He has never put his faith in the gradual evolution of the highest life; in education, in civilization, in the uplifting tendency of the mutual intercourse of nations, in the growth of a sentiment of the brotherhood of man, in the force of enlightened public opinion and self-interest. These idols of the world have never appealed to him. Now they have fallen he is not alarmed, he is not even surprised; *his* cause is vindicated. It is from all these things he has always dissented; all these things rested on the belief that man and this world are good, that given a chance they will develop all right. That was never the Dissenter's belief; and now that the heart of man has been proved once more to be desperately wicked, and the world has shown that it is possessed of an infinite capacity for going wrong, the Dissenter is prepared to begin all over again. But he will begin in his own way: renunciation, not amelioration, of the world; transformation, not development, of the individual.'

But this loyal Dissenter was the close friend of Foakes-Jackson, A. C. Benson, and Quiller Couch. He had only one good lung and was never able to move at more than a slow walking pace, yet he was the idol of the undergraduates and could tame the toughest of them without an effort. He had a keen sense of humour, as all the true saints have had. When the Church of St. Peter's in Lincoln was removed in order to widen a street, he visited the place and found part of the site occupied by the Fifty Shilling Tailors. Referring to this afterwards he said he had looked anxiously to see whether the Cathedral had been removed to make room for a Thirty-five Shilling Tailor! Mr. Brittain has done us a favour by giving us this picture of a loveable and brilliant soul.

Bad Prophets.

'You say historians are bad prophets. But have you ever thought of collecting the predictions of distinguished statesmen and public men? Men of letters are not infallible, but they compare very favourably with politicians. Here are a few examples; I have them in my pocket, I thought they would amuse you. I include one man of science, since they fancy themselves just now. Shelburne: "When the American colonies gain their independence, the sun of England will set, and her glories be eclipsed for ever." Washington in 1786: "The age of conquest has ceased." Sir Humphry Davy: "It would be as easy to bring down a bit of the moon as to light London with gas." Pitt in 1792: "There never was a time when one might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace." Bismarck: "Russia can never join France against Germany." Nelson: "Neither

Malta nor the Cape will ever be of any importance to Great Britain." Winckelmann in 1768: "In fifty years there will be at Rome neither Pope nor priest." William Wilberforce: "I dare not marry; the future is so unsettled." Shaftesbury in 1848: "Nothing can save the British Empire from shipwreck." Disraeli in 1847: "In industry, commerce, and agriculture there is no hope." Wellington in 1852: "I thank God I shall be spared from seeing the consummation of ruin that is gathering about us." Fox said in 1803 that a war with France would "effect the total destruction of the influence of this country on the Continent." Wellington in 1832: "Few people will be sanguine enough to imagine that we shall ever again be as prosperous as we have been." Gladstone in 1863: "Mr. Jefferson Davis has made an army, he has made a navy, and more than that, he has made a nation." In the summer of 1870 a Cabinet Minister said in Parliament that he saw no clouds which threatened peace in Europe. Arthur Young, Heine, George Meredith, and Matthew Arnold saw what was coming much better.' [1]

'Rejoice in the Lord alway.'

In November 1941 a plane on a mission from the 8th Army H.Q. was shot down and the pilot and the intelligence officer lost their lives. The intelligence officer was Captain Christopher Benn. 'He gladly gave his life for others because he had already discovered the secret of immortality.'

The short memoir of Christopher Benn by his brother, Captain John Benn (*I Say Rejoice*), is worthy of attention. The background of fact is briefly: On 6th April 1912 Christopher Benn was born, the third son of Ernest and Gwendolen Benn. Educated at Harrow and Cambridge he then chose the Bar in preference to going into the family publishing business. At the outbreak of war a brilliant career was opening before him. Attached to the War Office, after a year as a private soldier, he fretted at being in a comfortable job while others were facing danger, and made submissions to his superiors. The last phase is G.H.Q. Eighth Army, when he was promoted Captain.

Christopher Benn's religion was a very real part of his life. It had nothing in it of the nature of strained piety, but was marked by a singular quality of naturalness. Writing to his wife from the desert, he says, 'We had a sermon from *our* passage from Philippians: "Rejoice in the Lord alway."' Giving the 'heads,' he adds, 'but don't take them heavily.'

And writing to his father of his marriage: 'You talked about being able to pray together, and I want you to know that we have found out the truth of that as the only foundation, and *that* we can and do.' This is reflected in one of his letters to his wife: 'This whole adventure is made worth while for me, because I have something real to fight for—Oliver's future and those principles of faith, truth, and justice upon which we have tried to build our lives.' Again to his wife: 'By working away and forgetting self—that is the hardest thing, to be utterly selfless—I can contribute a little bit to victory. Victory is not only a national affair, but a personal matter too.'

The death of Laurence Binyon has brought back into our minds his poem 'For the Fallen,' and especially the stanza, engraved on one of the doorways of the British Museum:

> They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old:
> Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.
> At the going down of the sun and in the morning
> We will remember them.

Written in memory of the men of Rupert Brooke's generation it stands as a tribute to those of this war who, as Christopher Benn, 'gladly gave their lives for others.'

Ends and Means.

The Bishop of Durham in his Diocesan Magazine the *Bishoprick* says: 'In actual life it is impossible to draw a hard-and-fast line between "means" and "ends." There are many "ends," admirable in themselves, which might be attained by means altogether lamentable; or, again, some "ends" may be fairly readily attainable, while others, with our present resources or any that we can foresee, may be beyond our reach.

'It is obviously important that the preacher of "ends" should at least know enough about the best available means to enable him to judge along what kind of road he is inviting people to go, and should know too which ends may be reached or neared in a measurable time and which are likely to be for long out of our grasp. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that those whose primary business is with ends, and those who have the expert knowledge necessary for devising the means, should not work in such isolation as they commonly do.

'It is to be hoped that not only "centrally" but locally too there will be formed groups of men—clergy, social workers, business men, "working" men, economists, who will together discuss ends and means. Only so can there be real understanding and real progress.

'And this is a method which could be very widely used, no doubt on a small and simple scale, but with great ultimate possibilities. A great many parishes and congregations could do invaluable work by drawing both on the devotion and on the expert knowledge of their members for the doing of some piece of local investigation leading to action for local betterment. And action will lead not only to the discovery of new needs and opportunities, but will bring a bracing realism into our exhortations. . . .'

---

[1] W. R. Inge, *Talks in a Free Country*, 99.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.